

**AUTHORITIES ON ORATORY
USE OF ILLUSTRATIONS
AFTER-DINNER SPEAKING
ARGUMENTS**

**Practical Discussions and Suggestions, together with a
Collection of Addresses**

By

R. E. PATTISON KLINE



**NORTH AMERICAN INSTITUTE
CHICAGO**

Copyright, 1930

By

**NORTH AMERICAN INSTITUTE
CHICAGO**

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
Introduction	3
Our Duty to the English Tongue	
I. Authorities on Oratory—True Eloquence (<i>Daniel Webster</i>)—Eloquence (<i>Ralph Waldo Emerson</i>)—The Eloquence of Revolutionary Periods (<i>Rufus Choate</i>).....	7
II. After-Dinner Speaking—The Real Secret of After-Dinner Oratory (<i>Brander Matthews</i>)—Canada, England, and the United States (<i>Sir Wilfrid Laurier</i>)—Monsieur and Madame (<i>Paul Blouet</i>)—A Fine Speaker (<i>Miss Bolenius</i>)	33
III. Use of Illustrations.....	54
IV. Arguments—The House Divided (<i>Abraham Lincoln</i>)—Upon the Character of George Washington (<i>Edward Everett</i>)—Liberty and Union (<i>Daniel Webster</i>)—Reply to Hayne (<i>Daniel Webster</i>)—Coercion of Delinquent States (<i>Alexander Hamilton</i>)—The Call to Arms (<i>Patrick Henry</i>)—Liberty or Empire (<i>Patrick Henry</i>)—Panama Canal Tolls (<i>Emory B. Johnson</i>).....	66

PREFACE.

The present volume will furnish the student with matter for thought and study along several important lines. It has been deemed advisable to quote rather freely from the writings of those who have had unusual opportunities for knowing the characteristics of effective public speech and how these characteristics may be developed. The student cannot afford to neglect to give this part really sympathetic attention.

It is believed that the Chapters devoted to Use of Illustrations and After-Dinner Speaking will provide no little very practical aid to the student. The suggestions contained in these discussions are born of practical experience.

The last Chapter includes a number of argumentative addresses. They will furnish a basis for more continued study of

this important type of public appeal. It is easy to assert policies, principles and laws as being desirable, but a much more difficult process is involved in satisfactorily establishing, by really logical reasoning, the trustworthiness of such policies, principles and laws.

The author wishes to acknowledge gratefully the generous permission of publishers and others to use their material.

R. E. PATTISON KLINE.

**AUTHORITIES ON ORATORY—USE
OF ILLUSTRATIONS—AFTER-
DINNER SPEAKING—
ARGUMENTS.**

INTRODUCTION.

**OUR DUTY TO THE ENGLISH
TONGUE.**

When an ancient writer, trying to express the revelation of his God to him, said that it was “the word become flesh,” it was no careless figure of speech that he used. You have lived a good part of these fifteen years in the places where the word, the spirit of others, teachers, parents, the whole past has been becoming the man in you. And I hope this will not cease so long as you have flesh in which the spirit can reveal itself.

If this be true, how important becomes the word—that expression of yourselves

in which your flesh becomes spirit, and wanders free of you to work good or ill in the earth among men. And by its importance am I justified in asking your special pledge of devotion, as I speak for the last time to you as a class before you go up for your degrees, your devotion to the beauty, the purity, the integrity, the vitality of the tongue in which all your knowledges are latent, without which thought itself is impotent—to the protection of this tongue from the sloven, the ignorant, the vicious; to its ennobling among the arts.

I would have you go out lovers of your speech. This is a time of philanthropists, but we do not need their riches to add to our common vocabulary. It is richer than that of many, of most, tongues, though we are most of us seemingly content with a very meager possession. But we do need philologists, in the original meaning of that word, men in every walk of life who will use speech conscientiously, discriminat-ingly, intelligently, yet without pedantry or show.

The papers tell of the praise of the

mayor of college men in cleaning the streets, and all college men should be proud of that service given by one of their number. I hope that graduates of this college will come to serve the city in its every department. That is our peculiar opportunity and obligation as I see it; but incidentally you can constitute yourselves a speech-cleaning department, and begin by keeping clean and improving the speech before your own doors in the midst of the babel of voices about you.

To have free speech! That has come after long years of struggle. What we want now is clear speech, speech restrained to truth, speech expanded to truth. Democracy needs philologists who can teach her children, who can write her laws for her, who can compose an amendment to the Constitution which needs not to be interpreted, who can discover to others in plain, unambiguous English the good from the evil which they themselves have discerned. And here, as in no other place, is such speech needed, for here is peculiarly the place of the decision of things, and they

have ultimately to be decided in the flesh that has become word.

—*John H. Finley, President of the
College of the City of New
York.*

(Extract from an address to the graduating class, 1910.)

CHAPTER I.

AUTHORITIES ON ORATORY.

Oratory is the great power that moves nations to do and dare. It was Oratory that wrecked Rome and made Christianity live.

Extemporaneous speaking should be cultivated. However able and faithful a lawyer may be, people are slow to bring him business if he cannot make a speech.

—*Abraham Lincoln.*

The work of the orator from its very inception is inextricably mixed up with practice. It is cast in the mould to him by the mind of his hearers. It is an influence principally received from his audience so to speak in vapor, which he pours back upon them in a flood.

—*William E. Gladstone.*

Oratory is the masterful art. Poetry, painting, music, sculpture, architecture please, thrill, inspire; but oratory rules. The orator dominates those who hear him, convinces their reason, controls their judgment, compels their action. For the time being he is master. Through the clearness of his logic, the keenness of his wit, the power of his appeal, or that magnetic something which is felt and yet cannot be defined, or through all together, he sways his audience as the storm bends the branches of the forest. Hence it is that in all times this wonderful power has been something longed for and striven for. Demosthenes, on the beach, struggling with the pebbles in his mouth to perfect his articulation has been the great example. Yet it is often true of the orator, as of the poet: *nascitur non fit*. Patrick Henry seemed to be inspired as "Give me Liberty or give me Death" rolled from his lips. The untutored savage has shown himself an orator.

—David J. Brewer, *Late Justice
Supreme Court of United
States.*

'Ministering happiness through mercy and sympathy, the tongue also hath a ministry of instruction and inspiration, and is the almoner of universal bounty. There is no teacher like the tongue. Therefore all the men who have had disciples, who have made goodness epidemic, and ushered in new eras, have been great conversers.

Blessed are the happiness-makers whose tongues carry sweetness and sow mercy and inspiration everywhere.

Wholesome tongues are, indeed, "trees of life," and their words "like apples of gold lying in baskets of silver."

—*Newell Dwight Hillis.*

The orator is an artist, and sees everything, as Donatello saw his marble, as material for his art. If he is only an orator, he must make his sentence plangent as an ocean roll under a moonlit sky. The music of every orator lies in his personal rhythm. When this rhythm gets the upper hand, it simply dominates everything.

Shall we have no orators? We might as well try to get on without poets or musi-

cians. Eloquence has its unique and momentous service to civilization. The orators of each age created public sentiment; and lately, with the printing press, in the history of civilization, they have given life and form to public opinion, which, in other ages, has crystallized, out of their agitation, into great State Papers, like the Treaty of Wedmore, Magna Charta, Mayflower Compact, Declaration of Independence and Emancipation Proclamation. The end consecrates the instrument.

—*Frank W. Gunsaulus, D. D.*

I think that the power of speaking plainly and directly, in such a way as to be understood, is of very great value to a young man who wants to be in position to help others. The day of oratory, in the old sense, is past; but there never was a time when there was a greater appreciation of the power to talk directly, wisely and to the point in matters of public interest.

—*David Starr Jordan, President
Leland Stanford Junior Uni-
versity.*

I have no doubt that our college students and graduates are as patriotic in sentiment as the remainder of our people. The time, however, calls for something more than the holding of correct sentiments and opinions. If the old things that were good are to be retained or recovered, if new delusions are to be corrected, if the landmarks that should guide our nation's way are to be found again, if vexatious economic and social questions are to be settled in reason and justice, if political problems are to be discussed and determined in a spirit of fairness and patriotism, and if new perils that loom before us are to be averted, there is aggressive, stirring and organized work to be done.

The teachers, students and graduates of our colleges and universities cannot escape the responsibility which grows out of the fact that none are better prepared, mentally and intellectually, to engage in this service. Indisputable evidence of this is found in the splendid results accomplished by those of their number who have already entered the field. Why should not all en-

gage in the work? If any make excuse that it involves political activity which the daintiness of higher education should avoid, they discredit their love of country. If any still feel a sleepy indifference to civic duty induced by their college seclusion, they should shake it off before it becomes a paralysis of good citizenship; and if any are still afflicted with a supercilious pride of education, they should speedily realize that it is in the brotherhood of patriotic Americanism that the betterment of our political and social conditions must be wrought out. A shrewd old priest once said:—"Be up and about and out in the world. Be a man and live like a man."

—*Grover Cleveland.*

Sometimes they tell us that the age of public speaking is passed, that we do not need to have public speaking now as we used to, that the newspapers are taking the place of the platform, and that they so fully inform the people that it is not necessary to listen to speaking as a means

of giving information. I am not at all in accord with that sentiment. In fact, I think we need public speaking more now to correct the mistakes and misrepresentations of the press, for the newspapers are often published not in the interest of the public, but in the interest of private individuals who use the newspapers for their own ends. The age of public speaking will never be passed.

Ordinarily when you speak you must speak with the intention of saying something, and the object is to persuade, and if when you are through speaking those who listen begin to discuss what you say, . . . even if they do not all accept it, at least you have done something more than to merely make them think with you.

Two things are regarded as absolutely essential. One is that the person shall know what he is talking about and the other that he shall mean what he says. There can be no effective speaking without these two essentials. Some people can come nearer telling all they know than others, and some others have been afflicted

with that rare genius of telling what they do not know, but it is not safe to rely on that as a rule. If you are going to give information you must have it. You cannot make people understand a subject unless you understand that subject yourself. The more clearly you have a subject in mind the more clearly can you present that subject to the minds of others. But it is necessary to have something more than knowledge of the subject. You must have earnestness in its presentation. You must feel you have something to say that the people ought to hear. . . .

—*William Jennings Bryan.*

I do make this point in talking to young preachers and young people about pulpit address or oratory as it is called: My ideal of an effective public speech is the transfer to the public arena of the mood, order of thought, and manner of expression which characterize a genuine, hearty, natural, spontaneous conversation in private. Eminent speakers whom I have heard on both sides of the sea have been men who had

acquired the art of "talking" rather than orating, the simple, natural conversational tone, the "telling" people, the "heart to heart" talking in simple and natural fashion so that people in the pew forget that the man on the platform is not sitting beside them on the grass under the trees for a frank conversation. If men would converse every day on some great question and would think only of conversation on the subject and not of oratorical exploits, we should have a great deal more naturalness and effectiveness in pulpit discourse, as we do have at the bar where lawyers are so intent on carrying the point and making an impression on judge and jury that they necessarily speak with naturalness and effectiveness. A good sermon, or a good address is most effective when it is a sustained conversation in order of thought, tone, spontaneous gesture and the force which the interest in the subject naturally and necessarily inspires. Let men learn in everyday conversation to speak with accuracy, naturalness and earnestness, and when they rise to speak on

the rostrum, in the pulpit, at the bar, they will express themselves spontaneously and naturally and people will forget all about "oratory"—as they ought to do.

—*Bishop John H. Vincent.*

TRUE ELOQUENCE.

1. When public bodies are to be addressed on momentous occasions, when great interests are at stake, and strong passions excited, nothing is valuable in speech farther than as it is connected with high intellectual and moral endowments. Clearness, force, and earnestness are the qualities which produce conviction. True eloquence, indeed, does not consist in speech. It cannot be brought from far. Labor and learning may toil for it, but they will toil in vain. Words and phrases may be marshaled in every way, but they can not compass it. It must exist in the man, in the subject, and in the occasion.

2. Affected passion, intense expression, the pomp of declamation, all may aspire to it; they cannot reach it. It comes, if it comes at all, like the out-breaking of a fountain from the earth, or the bursting

forth of volcanic fires, with spontaneous, original, native force. The graces taught in the schools, the costly ornaments and studied contrivances of speech, shock and disgust men, when their own lives, and the fate of their wives, their children, and their country, hang on the decision of the hour. Then words have lost their power, rhetoric is vain, and all elaborate oratory contemptible. Even genius itself then feels rebuked and subdued, as in the presence of higher qualities.

3. Then patriotism is eloquent; then self-devotion is eloquent. The clear conception, outrunning the deductions of logic, the high purpose, the firm resolve, the dauntless spirit, speaking on the tongue, beaming from the eye, informing every feature, and urging the whole man onward, right onward to his object—this, this is eloquence; or rather, it is something greater and higher than all eloquence—it is action, noble, sublime, god-like action.

—*Daniel Webster.*

ELOQUENCE.

I do not know of any kind of history, except the event of a battle, to which people listen with more interest than to any anecdote of eloquence; and the wise think it better than a battle. It is a triumph of pure power, and it has a beautiful and prodigious surprise in it. For all can see and understand the means by which a battle is gained: they count the armies, they see the cannon, the musketry, the cavalry, and the character and advantages of the ground, so that the result is often predicted by the observer with great certainty before the charge is sounded.

Eloquence shows the power and possibility of man. There is one of whom we took no note, but on a certain occasion it appears that he has a secret virtue never suspected—that he can paint what has oc-

curred and what must occur, with such clearness to a company, as if they saw it done before their eyes. By leading their thought, he leads their will, and can make them do gladly what an hour ago they would not believe that they could be led to do at all; he makes them glad or angry or penitent at his pleasure; of enemies makes friends, and fills desponding men with hope and joy. After Sheridan's speech in the trial of Warren Hastings, Mr. Pitt moved an adjournment, that the House might recover from the overpowering effect of Sheridan's oratory.

We reckon the bar, the Senate, journalism, and the pulpit, peaceful professions; but you cannot escape the demand for courage in these, and certainly there is no true orator who is not a hero. His attitude in the rostrum, on the platform, requires that he counterbalance his auditory. He is challenger and must answer all comers. The orator must ever stand with foot forward, in the attitude of advancing. His speech must be just ahead of the assembly, ahead of the whole human

race, or it is superfluous. His speech is not to be distinguished from action. It is the electricity of action. It is action, as the general's word of command or chart of battle is action. I must feel that the speaker compromises himself to his auditory, comes for something—it is a cry on the perilous edge of the fight—or let him be silent.

No act indicates more universal health than eloquence. The special ingredients of this force are clear perceptions; memory; power of statement; logic; imagination; or the skill to clothe your thought in natural images; passion, which is the heat; and then a grand will, which, when legitimate and abiding, we call character, the height of manhood. As soon as a man shows rare power of expression, like Chatham, Erskine, Patrick Henry, Webster or Phillips, all the great interests, whether of state or of property, crowd to him to be their spokesman, so that he is at once a potentate, a ruler of men.

But this power which so fascinates and astonishes and commands is only the exag-

geration of a talent which is universal. All men are competitors in this art. We have all attended meetings called for some object in which no one had beforehand any warm interest. Every speaker rose unwillingly, and even his speech was a bad excuse; but it is only the first plunge which is formidable; and deep interest or sympathy thaws the ice, loosens the tongue, and will carry the cold and fearful presently into self-possession and possession of the audience. Go into an assembly well excited, some angry political meeting on the eve of a crisis. Then it appears that eloquence is as natural as swimming—an art which all men might learn, though so few do. It only needs that they should be once well pushed off into the water, overhead, without corks, and, after a mad struggle or two, they find their poise and the use of their arms, and henceforward they possess this new and wonderful element.

A good voice has a charm in speech as in song; sometimes of itself enchains attention, and indicates a rare sensibility, espe-

cially when trained to wield all its powers. The voice, like the face, betrays the nature and disposition, and soon indicates what is the range of the speaker's mind. Many people have no ear for music, but every one has an ear for skillful reading. Every one of us has at some time been the victim of a well-toned and cunning voice, and perhaps been repelled once for all by a harsh, mechanical speaker. The voice, indeed, is a delicate index of the state of mind.

These are ascending stairs—a good voice, winning manners, plain speech, chastened, however, by the schools in correctness; but we must come to the main matter, of power of statement—know your fact; hug your fact. For the essential thing is heat, and heat comes from sincerity. Speak what you do know and believe; and are personally in it; and are answerable for every word.

The orator must command the whole scale of the language, from the most elegant to the most low and vile. Every one has felt how superior in force is the

language of the street to that of the academy. The street must be one of his schools. Ought not the scholar to be able to convey his meaning in terms as short and strong as the porter or truckman uses to convey his? And Lord Chesterfield thought that “without being instructed in the dialect of the Halles no man could be a complete master of French.” The speech of the man in the street is invariably strong, nor can you mend it by making it what you call parliamentary. You say, “If he could only express himself”; but he does already, better than anyone can for him—can always get the ear of an audience to the exclusion of everybody else. Well, this is an example in point. That something which each man was created to say and do, he only or he best can tell you, and has a right to supreme attention so far. The power of their speech is, that it is perfectly understood by all; and I believe it to be true that when any orator at the bar or in the Senate rises in his thought, he descends in his language—that is, when he rises to any height of thought or of passion, he

comes down to a language level with the ear of all his audience. It is the merit of John Brown and of Abraham Lincoln—one at Charlestown, one at Gettysburg—in the two best specimens of eloquence we have had in this country. And observe that all poetry is written in the oldest and simplest words. Dr. Johnson said, “There is in every nation a style which never becomes obsolete, a certain mode of phraseology so consonant to the analogy and principles of its respective language as to remain settled and unaltered. This style is to be sought in the common intercourse of life among those who speak only to be understood, without ambition of eloquence. The polite are always catching modish innovations, and the learned forsake the vulgar, when the vulgar is right; but there is a conversation above grossness and below refinement, where propriety resides.”

—*Ralph Waldo Emerson.*

(By special permission of Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston, Mass.)

THE ELOQUENCE OF REVOLUTION- ARY PERIODS.

If you bear in mind that the aim of deliberative eloquence is *to persuade to an action*, and that to persuade to an action it must be shown that to perform it will gratify some one of the desires or affections or sentiments—you may call them, altogether, *passions*, which are the springs of all action, some love of our own happiness, some love of our country, some love of man, some love of honor, some approval of our own conscience, some fear or some love of God, you will see *that* eloquence will be characterized—first, by the nature of the actions to which it persuades; secondly, by the nature of the desire or affection or sentiment—the nature of the passion, in other words—by an appeal to which it seeks to persuade to action; and

then, I say, that the capital peculiarity of the eloquence of all times of revolution, is that the actions it persuades to are the highest and the most heroic which men can do, and the passions it would inspire, in order to persuade to them, are the most lofty which man can feel.

“High actions and high passions”—such are Milton’s words—high actions through and by high passions; these are the end and these the means of the orator of the revolution. Hence are his topics large, simple, intelligible, affecting. Hence are his views broad, impressive, popular; no trivial details, no wire-woven developments, no subtle distinctions and drawing of fine lines about the boundaries of ideas, no speculation, no ingenuity; all is elemental, comprehensive, intense, practical, unqualified, undoubting.

It is not of the small things of minor and instrumental politics he comes to speak, or men come to hear. It is not to speak or to hear about permitting an Athenian citizen to change his tribe; about permitting the Roman Knights to have

jurisdiction of trials equally with the Senate; it is not about allowing a £10 householder to vote for a member of Parliament; about duties on indigo, or onion-seed, or even tea.

“That strain you hear is of an
higher mood.”

It is the rallying cry of patriotism, of liberty, in the sublimest crisis of the State—of man. It is a deliberation of empire, of glory, of existence on which they come together. To be or not to be—that is the question.

Shall the children of the men of Marathon become slaves of Philip? Shall the majesty of the Senate and people of Rome stoop to wear the chains forging by the military executors of the will of Julius Cæsar? Shall the assembled representatives of France, just wakening from her sleep of ages to claim the rights of man—shall they disperse, their work undone, their work just commencing; and shall they disperse at the order of the king? or shall the messenger be bid to go, in the thunder-tones of Mirabeau—and tell his master that

“we sit here to do the will of our constituents, and that we will not be moved from these seats but by the point of a bayonet” ? Shall Ireland bound upward from her long prostration, and cast from her the last link of the British chain, and shall she advance “from injuries to arms, from arms to liberty,” from liberty to glory?

Shall the thirteen Colonies become, and be free and independent States, and come unabashed, unterrified, and equal, into the majestic assembly of the nations? These are the thoughts with which all bosoms are distended and oppressed. Filled with these, with these flashing in every eye, swelling every heart, pervading electric all ages, all orders, like a visitation, “an unquenchable public fire,” men come together—the thousands of Athens around the Bema, or the Temple of Dionysus—the people of Rome in the forum, the Senate in that council-chamber of the world—the masses of France, as the spring-tide, into her gardens of the Tuileries, her club-rooms, her hall of the convention—the representatives, the genius, the grace, the beauty of Ireland

into the Tuscan Gallery of her House of Commons—the delegates of the Colonies into the Hall of Independence of Philadelphia—thus men come—in an hour of revolution, to hang upon the lips from which they hope, they need, they demand to hear the things which belong to their national salvation, hungering for the bread of life.

And then and thus comes the orator of that time, kindling with their fire; sympathizing with that great beating heart; penetrated, not subdued; lifted up rather by a sublime and rare movement of history made real to his consciousness; charged with the very mission of life, yet unassured whether they will hear or will forbear; transcendent good within their grasp, yet a possibility that the fatal and critical opportunity of salvation will be wasted; the last evil of nations and of men overhanging, yet the siren song of peace—peace when there is no peace—chanted madly by some voice of sloth or fear—there and thus the orators of revolutions come to work their work! And what then is demanded,

and how it is to be done, you all see; and that in some of the characteristics of their eloquence they must all be alike.

Actions, not law or policy, whose growth and fruits are to be slowly evolved by time and calm; actions daring, doubtful but instant; the new things of a new world—these are what the speaker counsels; large, elementary, gorgeous ideas of right, of equality, of independence, of liberty, of progress through convulsion—these are the principles from which he reasons, *when he reasons*—these are the pinions of the thought on which he soars and stays.

Then the primeval and indestructible sentiments of the breast of man—his sense of right, his estimation of himself, his sense of honor, his love of fame, his triumph and his joy in the dear name of country, the trophies that tell of the past, the hopes that gild and herald her dawn—these are the springs of action to which he appeals—these are the chords his fingers sweep, and from which he draws out the troubled music, “solemn as death, serene as the undying confidence of patriotism,” to

which he would have the battalions of the people march!

Directness, plainness, a narrow range of topics, few details, few but grand ideas, a headlong tide of sentiment and feeling; vehement, indignant, and reproachful reasonings—winged general maxims of wisdom and life; an example from Plutarch; a pregnant sentence of Tacitus; thoughts going forth as ministers of nature in robes of light, and with arms in their hands; thoughts that breathe and words that burn—these vaguely, approximately, express the general type of all this speech.

—*Rufus Choate.*

CHAPTER II.

AFTER-DINNER SPEAKING.

After-dinner speaking is one of the more difficult forms of public speech. Nevertheless, it is desirable that all should cultivate the ability to make an acceptable appearance in this mode of address. It is becoming more and more the custom for men and women to meet around the festal banquet board. Again, the serious address after a banquet or dinner or luncheon is, today, far more the custom than formerly. It is reasonable to believe that this custom will become more popular as cities grow and interests become more related and complex. It will be wise, therefore, for those who plan to develop power in public speech to give due attention to this type of utterance.

In the main the end of after-dinner speaking is that of entertainment. Now

and then it will occur that a society or organization desires to combine the pleasure of the banquet with the intellectual stimulus of a serious address, or of a number of such addresses. But in the main the after-dinner speech is not of this kind. Bright, clever, witty, humorous, satirical, vivacious are terms that describe pretty correctly the nature of the after-dinner speech. It may be the case that under the lighter vein there will run a more serious philosophical strain. In the midst of the humor some striking truth may be sent home by a quick thrust.

Here is the place for the good story, but it must be a good one. It must not be a long one. It ought to be striking in character and quick in movement and method. There is place in this kind of utterance for the sincere compliment passed with judgment and excellent taste. A bit of tender, human, beautiful and warming sentiment is acceptable as providing a momentary foil to the witty, humorous part of the speech.

Of delivery it is to be observed that it

is to have the same character as the matter. The speech must move on; it must never lag; the speaker must have it well in hand; if he has not been able to get it well in hand by means of preparation beforehand it will be wise, unless he has become expert through long experience, to say a few words only, and sit down.

The delivery is to be bright, alert, animated, full of zest, keenly alive, and abounding in the radiation of a vital personality.

By permission of the publishers the author is permitted to quote a valuable portion of Brander Matthews' most excellent discussion of "The Real Secret of After-Dinner Oratory."

THE REAL SECRET OF AFTER-DINNER ORATORY.

A friend of mine considers it to be a most curious coincidence that the rise of after-dinner oratory in New York was almost simultaneous with the decline of negro minstrelsy. He is ready enough to admit that the banquet-hall is not the fit arena for the rushing magniloquence of Patrick Henry, but he holds also that it should not be a mere circus-ring for the idle capering of Joe Miller. He tells me that even at the reunions of the alumni of his college, where those present may be supposed to be every one a gentleman and a scholar, he is annoyed to discover that not a few of the speakers vie with one another in stringing together cheap anecdotes wholly unrelated to the topic in hand; and he declares that this is no better than the competitive grinning through a horse-

collar which used to be an attraction in the country fairs of Merry England. He wishes absolutely to banish the anecdote from the festive board, on the ground that the man who is invited to address him has no right to substitute for the expected speech the recital of a leaf from an old jest-book.

And here it seems to me that my justly irritated friend goes too far. Like many reformers, he urges total abstinence where all that is needed is moderation in use. The anecdote should be ancillary always; it is a hand-maiden to be summoned only when wanted. The comic story is a good servant, but a bad master. Only too true is it that some postprandial addresses are so thin in theme, and so thick with jokes, that they resemble the peanut candy where you cannot see the candy for the peanuts, or (to put it only a little differently) where you cannot catch the thought for the chestnuts.

But in its proper place the anecdote is excellent. Indeed, I once heard Lowell, that most expert and easy of speakers, declare that a good after-dinner speech

ought to contain a platitude, a quotation, and an anecdote.

Effective as the quotation may be when sustained and relieved by its accompanying platitude, its force is less than that of the anecdote adroitly chosen, unexpected in its unfolding, and having concealed in it a pungent pertinence revealing itself only at the very end. A single story, and one only, can thus affect the listeners; to add another would be to spoil this. We are told that the five-minute speeches with which Judge Hoar year after year delighted the Harvard chapter of the Phi Beta Kappa contained "but one original idea, clearly stated, and but one fresh story, well told."

This is indeed a model to be admired of all men; yet how few of us will take the trouble of copying it! Concision is not a free gift; it is to be won only by strenuous effort and resolute self-conquest.

Wearisome as this vapid dribble of words can be, it is not so offensive to some of us as the equally empty speech which is merely a mosaic of stories supposed to be

laughter-provoking. Judge Hoar made his point, and drove it home, because he had one thought and one anecdote; but what wonder is it that they make no impression who have twenty anecdotes and no thought? A hodgepodge of jests of all ages and of all countries, illustrating no theme, thrown together fortuitously, with the infelicity of a chance page of the patent-medicine almanac—what is this but the crackling of thorns under a pot?

The speaker who rambles and ambles along, saying nothing, and his fellow, the speaker who links jest to jest, saying little more, are both of them unabashed in the presence of an audience. They are devoid of all shyness. They are well aware that they have “the gift of the gab”; they rejoice in its possession; they lie in wait for occasions to display it. They have helped to give foreigners the impression that every American is an oratorical revolver, ready with a few remarks whenever any chairman may choose to pull the trigger. And yet there are Americans not a

few to whom the making of an after-dinner speech is a most painful ordeal.

Hawthorne was as uncomfortable on his feet as were Thackeray and Irving; but his resolute will steeled him for the trial. When he dined with the Mayor of Liverpool, he was called upon after the toast of the United States. "Being at bay, and with no alternative, I got upon my legs and made a response," he wrote in his notebook, appending this comment: "Anybody may make an after-dinner speech who will be content to talk onward without saying anything. My speech was not more than two or three inches long; . . . but, being once started, I felt no embarrassment, and went through it as coolly as if I were going to be hanged."

He also notes that his little speech was quite successful, "considering that I did not know a soul there, except the Mayor himself, and that I am wholly unpracticed in all sorts of oratory, and that I had nothing to say." To each of these three considerations of Hawthorne's it would be instructive to add a comment, for he spoke

under a triple disadvantage. A speech cannot really be successful when the speaker has nothing to say. It is rarely successful unless he knows the tastes and the temper of those he is addressing. It can be successful only casually unless he has had some practice in the simpler sort of oratory.

Assuming that the man who is called to his feet after dinner can so control his voice as to be heard and understood, the secret of certain success lies in his having something to say which he wants to say to that audience, and which that audience wants to hear from him.

If the speaker has something to say that he really wants to say, then his interest in the subject will prove contagious. If he also has the tact to say this simply, briefly, brightly, unaffectedly, and to stop promptly when he has said it, then he cannot fail. If, further, what he has to say happens to be something that his hearers are anxious to be told, then his success is assured. If, at last, with all these advantages he has the added good fortune of hitting the temper

of the audience, then what awaits him is little less than a triumph. There is an electrical contact instantly; the circuit of sympathy is complete; and his hearers laugh at his lightest jest, and thrill at his hint of an appeal to their higher feelings.

—*Brander Matthews.*

(By special permission of Longmans, Green & Company.)

CANADA, ENGLAND, AND THE UNITED STATES.

[From an address in Brewer's "The World's Best Orations," Vol. VII, Ferd. P. Kaiser, St. Louis, Chicago, publishers, by Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. President, and Gentlemen:—I very fully and very cordially appreciate the very kind feelings which have just now been uttered by the toastmaster in terms so eloquent, and which you gentlemen have accepted and received in so sympathetic a manner. Let me say at once, in the name of my fellow-Canadians who are here with me and also, I may say, in the name of the Canadian people, that these feelings we shall at all times reciprocate; reciprocate, not only in words evanescent, but in actual living deeds.

Because I must say that I feel that, though the relations between Canada and the United States are good, though they

are brotherly, though they are satisfactory, in my judgment they are not as good, as brotherly, as satisfactory as they ought to be. We are of the same stock. We spring from the same races on one side of the line as on the other. We speak the same language. We have the same literature, and for more than a thousand years we have had a common history.

Let me recall to you the lines which, in the darkest days of the Civil War, the Puritan poet of America issued to England:—

“Oh, Englishmen! Oh, Englishmen!
In hope and creed,
In blood and tongue, we are brothers,
We all are heirs of Runnymede.”

Brothers we are, in the language of your own poet. May I not say that while our relations are not yet always as brotherly as they should have been, may I not ask, Mr. President, on the part of Canada and on the part of the United States, if we are sometimes too prone to stand by the full conceptions of our rights, and exact all our

rights to the last pound of flesh? May I not ask if there have not been too often between us petty quarrels, which happily do not wound the heart of the nation?

There was a civil war in the last century. There was a civil war between England, then, and her colonies. The union which then existed between England and her colonies was severed. If it was severed, American citizens, as you know it was, through no fault of your fathers, the fault was altogether the fault of the British Government of that day. If the British Government of that day had treated the American colonies as the British Government for the last twenty or fifty years has treated its colonies; if Great Britain had given you then the same degree of liberty which it gives to Canada, my country; if it had given you, as it has given us, legislative independence absolute—the result would have been different; the course of victory, the course of history, would have been very different.

But what has been done cannot be undone. You cannot expect that the union

which was then severed shall ever be restored; but can we not expect—can we not hope that the banners of England and the banners of the United States shall never, never again meet in conflict, except those conflicts provided by the arts of peace, such as we see today in the harbor of New York in the contest between the *Shamrock* and the *Columbia* for the supremacy of naval architecture and naval prowess? Can we not hope that if ever the banners of England and the banners of the United States are again to meet on the battlefield, they shall meet entwined together in the defense of some holy cause, in the defense of holy justice, for the defense of the oppressed, for the enfranchisement of the downtrodden, and for the advancement of liberty, progress, and civilization?

MONSIEUR AND MADAME.

[From a speech in "Modern Eloquence," Vol. I, Geo. L. Shuman and Company, Chicago, publishers, by Paul Blouet (Max O'Rell).]

Now, the attitude of men towards women is very different, according to the different nations to which they belong. You will find a good illustration of that different attitude of men toward women in France, in England, and in America, if you go to the dining-rooms of their hotels. You go to the dining-room, and you take, if you can, a seat near the entrance door, and you watch the arrival of the couples, and also watch them as they cross the room and go to the table that is assigned to them by the head waiter. Now, in Europe, you would find a very polite head waiter, who invites you to go in, and asks you where you will sit; but in America the head waiter is a most mag-

nificent potentate who lies in wait for you at the door, and bids you to follow him sometimes in the following respectful manner, beckoning, "There." And you have got to do it, too.

I traveled six times in America, and I never saw a man so daring as not to sit there. In the tremendous hotels of the large cities, where you have got to go to Number 992 or something of the sort, I generally got a little entertainment out of the head waiter. He is so thoroughly persuaded that it would never enter my head not to follow him, he will never look round to see if I am there. Why, he knows I am there, but I'm not. I wait my time, and when he has got to the end I am sitting down waiting for a chance to be left alone. He says, "You cannot sit here." I say: "Why not? What is the matter with this seat?" He says, "You must not sit there." I say, "I don't want a constitutional walk; don't bother, I'm all right." Once, indeed, after an article in the *North American Review*—for your head waiter in America reads reviews—a head waiter told

me to sit where I pleased. I said, "Now, wait a minute, give me time to realize that; do I understand that in this hotel I am going to sit where I like?" He said, "Certainly!" He was in earnest. I said, "I should like to sit over there at that table near the window." He said, "All right, come with me." When I came out, there were some newspaper people in the hotel waiting for me, and it was reported in half a column in one of the papers, with one of those charming headlines which are so characteristic of American journalism, "Max sits where he likes!" Well, I said, you go to the dining-room, you take your seat, and you watch the arrival of the couples, and you will know the position of men. In France Monsieur and Madame come in together abreast, as a rule arm in arm. They look pleasant, smile, and talk to each other. They smile at each other, even though married.

In England, in the same class of hotel, John Bull comes in first. He does not look happy. John Bull loves privacy. He does not like to be obliged to eat in the presence

of lots of people who have not been introduced to him, and he thinks it very hard he should not have the whole dining-room to himself. That man, though, mind you, in his own house undoubtedly the most hospitable, the most kind, the most considerate of hosts in the world, that man in the dining-room of a hotel always comes in with a frown. He does not like it, he grumbles, and mild and demure, with her hands hanging down, modestly follows Mrs. John Bull. But in America, behold the arrival of Mrs. Jonathan! behold her triumphant entry, pulling Jonathan behind! Well, I like my own country, and I cannot help thinking that the proper and right way is the French. Ladies, you know all our shortcomings. Our hearts are exposed ever since the rib which covered them was taken off. Yet we ask you kindly to allow us to go through life with you, like the French, arm in arm, in good friendship and camaraderie.

A FINE SPEAKER.

The following outline prepared by Miss Bolenius in her "Teaching of Oral English," is a very interesting summary:

Position

1. Body—Erect, graceful.
2. Head—Up.
3. Eyes—Alert, sparkling with interest, holding the whole audience.
4. Hands—Loose, used to emphasize points naturally, gestures.

Voice

1. Loud—What is the use of saying anything if it cannot be heard!
2. Well-modulated—Speaking in one tone is disagreeable—so is the sing-song speaker. Let the voice go up and down pleasantly; let it be flexible.
3. Good Quality—Not nasal, sharp or gruff, but musical.

Style

1. Correct — Grammar, punctuation, vocabulary.
2. Clear—Know what you mean yourself, and tell it so that others understand.
3. Concise—Use few words. Do not ramble or say things indirectly.
4. Coherent—Link one sentence naturally to the one before, to avoid abruptness.
5. Convincing—Learn to use all the devices that improve style. A rhetoric text-book explains these. Use them.

Ideas

1. Fullness—Get ideas from reading, observation, conversation, imagination, etc.
2. Correctness—Be accurate in your information; avoid the slipshod process in thinking.
3. Interest—Widen your interests. Broaden your outlook. Choose interesting subjects, of which you know something, subjects in which the audience is interested.

Another interesting outline in this connection is that of Miss Ward, "Oral Composition" for "The Conditions of Good Speaking," as follows:

Preparation

A good subject.

Good material.

A good outline.

Expression as Conditioned by Thought

The paragraph.

The sentence.

Words.

Actual Speaking

The use of the body.

The use of the voice.

Expression through variation.

Enunciation.

Pronunciation.

CHAPTER III.

USE OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

The effective speaker has always made use of the illustration frequently. A moment's thought will show why this is the case. It is greatly needed that thought be made as clear as possible. But many times an idea cannot readily be put into such language that it is instantly understood, or readily grasped. Even when one has trained himself by severe discipline to the mastery of clear expression it will not always be possible to attain by mere language the end desired. To make the general thought specific, to make the abstract idea concrete, to make the unknown known, to make the evasive suggestion tangible—this is the service of the illustration.

Most men and women think in terms of past experience. Illustrations are bits of

life or knowledge taken from what is considered a common experience, and used to place some other bit of life or knowledge within the circumference of the experience of the hearer or reader.

One value of the illustration has been suggested—it is an aid to clearness. It is also an aid to impressiveness—forcefulness. By the use of this device in reasoning one may secure more easily assent to a proposition before rejected. It is equally effective in arousing men and women to action. To liken that which is not understood to something now understood is to secure clearness of idea; to compare something that does not now impress with something that impresses deeply is to secure forcefulness of idea; to show by illustration that a belief now denied is akin to one long held to, is to convince; and to show that action now appealed for has been indulged in in other matters is to secure action. It will be found that whatever the end in speaking may be, the illustration will serve, when wisely used, as a most effective aid in securing the end determined upon.

Inquiry may, then, be made as to the sources from which illustrations may be drawn. The speaker is not limited. Every phase, condition, state, realm of life and matter may be drawn upon for illustrations. The anecdote—a description of a single incident—is frequently used; a story often serves most excellently to illustrate; a reference to experience is frequently effective; the use of established scientific facts is often needed; the arraying of figures may greatly aid the purpose; and lastly figures of speech prove of much service.

While illustrations may be taken from every avenue of life, there are several characteristics that an illustration must possess if it is to be of the greatest value. A somewhat wide study of the use of illustrations by the masters will lead to a surprise. The student will be forcibly struck by the fact of their brevity and simplicity. The fact that they are so very brief and simple may be something of a disappointment to the student at first. But upon second thought, it will be seen that their

force lies in the truth that they are both simple and brief. Another characteristic they ought also to have: that of being within the knowledge and the experience of the masses.

On page 63 of the volume of "Selected Speeches for Practice," the second and third paragraphs furnish an instance of the use of illustration. By massing of facts thus the idea is set forth more forcefully than would have been the case had there been the mere statement that working men spend much more money upon drink than do the rich. Again, on page 65 the reference to the Pennsylvania Central Railroad and the New York Central Railroad strengthens materially the point that is being made. Study carefully the use of a bit from real life which appears in the short selection, "Strength Realizing Weakness." It is very clear that the idea could not have been made nearly so moving had no illustration been used. Study the illustrations to be found in the selection, "Defeat and Triumph," on page 89. Are they wisely chosen? Those who know something of

history and painting will feel the full value of the illustrations used in this speech, but to others they will be of little service. It becomes clear, then, that this device must fall within the experience of the hearer if it is to be effective. Sometimes it occurs that an historical allusion not familiar to the audience will be of great illustrative value. It seems that nothing else will serve the need so well. Then one may use the historical fact, if he will first state what it is, what its setting was, and what its significance is. So it is possible to refer in a speech to a scientific fact, or business fact, that is unknown to many, and thus fail in producing the effect desired. The necessary characteristic of the illustration is that it must be one within the knowledge of the audience.

If in addition to being simple, brief, and well-known, an illustration is a striking one, its force will be all the greater. The usual existing in unusual relations, the common showing uncommon characteristics, the well-known appearing in a new light—illustrations of such nature will

surely strike home with greater impact, thus demanding sharper attention.

Note, for example, this: "Since the November of 1860, his horizon has been black with storms."—Page 66, in *Analysis of Oratorical Style*. "It stood like a lone island in a sea full of storms."—Same. "In one hour, under the blow of a single bereavement, joy lay without a pulse, without a gleam, or breath."—Same, page 68. "Then shall thy light break forth as the morning."—Same, page 97.

Further, if the illustrations are new they will arouse greater attention and develop more thorough thinking. Many stock illustrations, stock stories, stock facts, have been used again and again by so many speakers that one who is accustomed to hear much public speech will be thoroughly acquainted with them. Better it will be to use no illustration, as a rule, than to use one with grey hairs. Many, many quotations, proverbs, maxims, and epigrams are used by speakers. When one of these has been used so often that people have grown tired of it, it loses its force. It

is said, then, that the quotation or proverb has become trite. Very seldom will it be wise to use the trite saying. If, too, the illustration is a bit of true life, that is, not a product of the imagination, its power is all the greater.

There remains one other consideration in this connection. An illustration must illustrate. It would seem that such a caution is unnecessary. Such is not the fact, however. The beginner will find it wise to scrutinize each illustration he plans to use in order to be sure that it actually throws light upon the idea under discussion.

Finally, the really effective illustration illustrates instantly. If the hearer is compelled to spend somewhat of thought upon the illustration before he recognizes its illuminative character, then it falls short of being an effective device. The more quickly the audience recognizes its purpose the more valuable is the illustration.

To summarize, the illustration must be brief, simple, well-known, striking, new, if possible, true; must really illustrate, and must perform its work instantly.

In this connection it will be valuable to consider figures of speech, inasmuch as these speech devices are used as a mode of illustration. This rhetorical expedient is a mode of expressing immaterial and abstract ideas in terms of the material and physical realm, or pointing out a likeness between them. If it were desired to convey the idea of the very great rapidity with which a driver drove his horse one might say, "He drove like a Jehu." But here, as in the other methods of illustrating already spoken of, the figure of speech is ineffective if there are any considerable number who do not know who Jehu was.

Figures of speech must answer to the same requirements that ordinary illustrations do.

While "figure of speech" is a wide term covering almost every form of language that is a departure from a plain method of speech, there are nine types which it is wise to consider:

The Exclamation, an exclamatory form of statement used in place of the declarative. "How wonderful! How divine!"

Interrogation, the asking of a question with such suggestion that the answer is at once obvious. "Shall the children of the men of Marathon become the slaves of Philip?"

Hyperbole, an exaggeration that all recognize as such. Dickens describes one of his characters as showing "acres of shirt-front."

Irony, the use of words which suggest the opposite meaning to that which the words actually state. "It was very kind of you to remind me of my humiliation!"

Vision, in which that in the future is pictured as now to be seen. "And bending down humbly as Elisha did, and praying that my eyes may be made to see, I catch the vision of this Republic—its mighty forces in balance, and its unspeakable glory falling on all its children—chief among the federation of English-speaking people—plenty streaming from its borders, and light from its mountain tops—working out its mission under God's approving eye, until the dark continents are open, and the highways of earth established, and the

shadows lifted—and the jargons of the nations stilled and the perplexities of babel straightened—and under one language, one liberty and one God, all the nations of the world hearkening to the American drum beats, and girding up their loins, shall march amid the breaking of the millennial dawn into the paths of righteousness and peace!”

Apostrophe, speaking in direct address to something inanimate, or to one not present. “Four years ago, O Illinois, we took from your midst an untried man.”

Metonymy, a statement in which a part, or an attribute, or an accompaniment, or example of an object is made to stand for the object itself. “He loves his bottle.” “The bench and the bar are both corrupt.” “A fleet of ten sail.”

Metaphor, one thing spoken of in direct terms of another. “This news will prove a bitter draught.” “His tongue dropped manna.” “The huge Leviathan lay down, and was still,” referring to a great city. “At last the watcher beheld the gray dawn for the country.”

Personification, the speaking of the inanimate and the abstract as if animate. "Love's arms were wreathed about the neck of Hope."

Simile, the comparing of one thing or quality with another in a more than ordinarily striking comparison. This is sometimes classed as a figure of speech, but is denied this classification by some authorities. "He drove like a Jehu." "With face white as chalk." "As wise as a serpent, and as peaceful as a dove."

The selections provided for practice in the first and third volumes will furnish a large field for the further study of figures of speech. The student is urged to make himself thoroughly familiar with the uses of figures of speech through study of the many examples furnished by these speeches.

There is one caution to be observed in the use of figures of speech. This is, that one must be careful not to mix his figures. "All these kindled up such a surge of joy as no words may describe." As the usual suggestion secured by the use of the word

“surge” is that of a great wave of water, it is questionable whether Beecher was justified in speaking of “kindling up” a “surge” of joy. “You have not tasted the full force of the joke yet.” Inasmuch as force is felt and not tasted, the use here of the word “tasted” is unwise. This illustrates the error of the mixed figure of speech.

CHAPTER IV.

ARGUMENTS.

Inasmuch as public speech frequently makes an attempt to convince of the truth or falsity of a proposition, it has seemed best to give the student a number of examples of debates delivered in legislative bodies and political movements, together with one example of the usual argumentative speech given before a non-legislative audience.

The student is earnestly urged to give these speeches somewhat of careful study. Lesson nineteen was a discussion of the main methods of argumentation. After having studied this lesson thoroughly set about the analysis of the specimens of argument provided in the following pages.

Select each proposition submitted by the speaker, after which test his argument to see if he has convincingly proved it. If not,

test it again to ascertain where the weakness is. Having selected each conclusion offered, make a similar test. In each instance where the argument is not conclusive, study it until you think you can remedy the defect in the process of reasoning.

THE HOUSE DIVIDED.

[This speech was delivered at Ottawa, Illinois, August 21, 1858, in reply to the opening speech of Douglas. Douglas had charged Lincoln with maintaining revolutionary doctrines in a speech at Springfield, in which he declared that "a house divided against itself cannot stand."]

I have no purpose, either directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the states where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so. I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and the black races. There is a physical difference be-

tween the two, which, in my judgment, will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality; and inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position. I have never said anything to the contrary, but I hold that, notwithstanding all this, there is no reason in the world why the negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I hold that he is as much entitled to these as the white man. I agree with Judge Douglas that the negro is not my equal in many respects—certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual endowment. But in the right to eat the bread, without the leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man.

The Judge has read from my speech in Springfield in which I say that “a house divided against itself cannot stand.” Does the Judge say it can stand? I would like

to know if it is his opinion that a house divided against itself can stand. If he does, then there is a question of veracity, not between him and me, but between the Judge and an authority of a somewhat higher character.

I know that the Judge may readily enough agree with me that the maxim which was put forth by the Saviour is true, but he may allege that I misapply it; and the Judge has a right to urge that in my application I do misapply it, and then I have a right to show that I do not misapply it. When he undertakes to say that because I think this nation, so far as the question of slavery is concerned, will all become one thing or all the other, I am in favor of bringing about a dead uniformity in the various states in all their institutions, he argues erroneously. The great variety of the local institutions in the states, springing from differences in the soil, differences in the face of the country, and in the climate, are bonds of union. They do not make "a house divided against itself," but they make a house united. If they produce

in one section of the country what is called for by the wants of another section, and this other section can supply the wants of the first, they are not matters of discord but bonds of union. But can this question of slavery be considered as among these varieties in the institutions of the country? I leave it to you to say whether, in the history of our government, this institution of slavery has not always failed to be a bond of union, and, on the contrary, been an apple of discord and an element of division in the house. I ask you to consider whether, so long as the moral constitution of men's minds shall continue to be the same, after this generation and assemblage shall sink into the grave, and another race shall arise with the same moral and intellectual development we have, whether, if that institution is standing in the same irritating position in which it now is, it will not continue an element of division?

If so, then I have a right to say that, in regard to this question, the Union is a house divided against itself; and when the Judge reminds me that I have often said

to him that the institution of slavery has existed for eighty years in some states, and yet it does not exist in some others, I agree to the fact, and I account for it by looking at the position in which our fathers originally placed it—restricting it from the new territories where it had not gone, and legislating to cut off its source by the abrogation of the slave trade, thus putting the seal of legislation against its spread. The public mind did rest in the belief that it was in the course of ultimate extinction. But lately, I think that he and those acting with him have placed that institution on a new basis, which looks to the perpetuity and nationalization of slavery. And while it is placed upon this new basis, I say that I believe we shall not have peace upon the question until the opponents of slavery arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or, on the other hand, that its advocates will push it forward until it shall become alike lawful in all the states, old as well as new, north as well as south. Now

I believe if we could arrest the spread, and place it where Washington and Jefferson and Madison placed it, it would be in the course of ultimate extinction, and the public mind would, as for eighty years past, believe that it was in the course of ultimate extinction. The crisis would be past, and the institution might be let alone in the states where it exists, yet it would be going out of existence in the way best for both the black and the white races.

—*Abraham Lincoln.*

UPON THE CHARACTER OF GEORGE WASHINGTON.

[Mr. Everett declares that Washington was called upon to take part in measures which were without precedent, and he and his associates were compelled to form their own plan of government. “I doubt if a hundred pages had been written to which Washington and the men of his age could refer for such lessons as to us — drawn from the writings and examples of the Revolutionary age — are as familiar as household words.”]

There was no Washington in the seventeenth century, in the pure mirror of whose character the Washington of the eighteenth century could mold and fashion his youthful virtues, or rehearse the great part he was to act in life.

There was none in America, there was none in Europe, there was none in the mod-

ern world, there was none in the ancient world. I cast my eyes along the far-stretching galleries of history, still echoing to the footsteps of the mighty dead; I behold with admiration the images and the statues of the great and good men with which they are accorded. I see many who deserved well of their country in civil and in military life—on the throne, in the council chamber, on the battle field—but I behold in the long line, no other Washington. I return from the search up and down the pathways of time, grateful to the Providence which, at the solemn moment, when the destinies of the Continent were suspended in the balance of doubtful future, raised up a chieftain endowed with every quality of mind and heart to guide the fortunes of a nascent state.

If, then, we claim for Washington this solitary eminence among the great and good, the question will naturally be asked, in what the peculiar and distinctive excellence of his character consisted; and to this fair question I own, my friends, I am tasked to find an answer that does full justice to

my own conceptions and feelings. It is easy to run over the heads of such a contemplation; to enumerate the sterling qualities which he possessed, and the defects from which he was free; but when all is said in this way that can be said, with whatever justice of honest eulogy and whatever sympathy of appreciation, we feel that there is a depth which we have not sounded, a latent power we have not measured, a mysterious beauty of character which you can no more describe in words than you can paint a blush; a moral fascination, so to express it, which all feel but which we cannot analyze nor trace to its elements. All the personal traditions of Washington assure us that there was a serene dignity in his presence, which charmed while it awed the boldest who approached him.

You feel as if you are gazing into that patient blue eye, where resignation shades into sadness; that you are looking upon a man whose word you would respect as an uninspired scripture, whose probity you would trust with uncounted gold, whose counsels you would lay up in your heart as

those of a dying father, whose lead you would implicitly follow in the darkest hours of trial, whose good opinion you would not barter for the wealth of the Indies; a man toward whom affection rises into reverence, and reverence melts back into childish, tearful love.

I am disposed to place the distinctive beauty and excellence of Washington's character in that well-balanced aggregate of powers and virtues for which he was distinguished, and which necessarily excludes the possession of one or two highly developed prominent traits. No one, I think, who has carefully reflected on the subject but will come to the conclusion that, instead of being improved, his character would have been impaired by any such dazzling quality, especially when we take into account the defects with which such qualities are sure to be accompanied. The ardent and ungoverned temperament, the indomitable will, often another name for arrogant obstinacy and selfishness, the passionate love of distinction and applause which enter so largely in most cases into

what is called a brilliant public character, would have destroyed the beauty and broken down the strength of Washington's. The ancient philosophers placed the true conception of perfect manhood in the possession of those powers and qualities which are required for the honorable and successful discharge of the duties of life, each in the golden mean, equally removed from excess in either direction, and all in due proportion. This type of true greatness I find more fully realized in the character of Washington than in that of any other chieftain or ruler of ancient or modern times. He did not possess a few brilliant qualities in that exaggerated degree in which they are habitually ascribed to the heroes of poetry and romance, but he united all the qualities required for the honorable and successful conduct of the greatest affairs, each in the happy mean of a full maturity, and all in that true proportion in which they balance and sustain each other.

All the great qualities of disposition and action, which so eminently fitted him for the service of his fellow men, were founded

on the basis of a pure Christian morality, and derived their strength and energy from that vital source. He was great as he was good; he was great because he was good; and I believe, as I do in my existence, that it was an important part in the design of Providence in raising him up to be the leader of the Revolutionary struggle, and afterwards the first President of the United States, to rebuke prosperous ambition and successful intrigue; to set before the people of America, in the morning of their national existence, a living example to prove that armies may be best conducted, and governments most ably and honorably administered, by men of sound moral principle; to teach to gifted and aspiring individuals, and the parties they lead, that, though a hundred crooked paths may conduct to a temporary success, the one plain and straight path of public and private virtue can alone lead to a pure and lasting fame and the blessings of posterity.

Born beneath a humble but virtuous roof, brought up at the knees of a mother not unworthy to be named with the noblest

matrons of Rome or Israel, the “good boy,” as she delighted to call him, passed uncorrupted through the temptations of the solitary frontier, the camp, and the gay world, and grew up the good man. Engaging in early youth in the service of his country, rising rapidly to the highest trusts, office and influence and praise, passing almost the bounds of human desert, did nothing to break down the austere simplicity of his manners or to shake the solid basis of his virtues. Placed at the head of the suffering and discontented armies of his country, urged by the tempter to change his honest and involuntary dictatorship of influence into a usurped dictatorship of power, reluctantly consenting to one reelection to the Presidency and positively rejecting a second, no suspicion ever crossed the mind of an honest man—let the libelers say what they would, for libelers I am sorry to say there were in that day as in this, men who pick their daily dishonorable bread out of the characters of men as virtuous as themselves, and they spared not Washington—but the suspicion

never entered into the mind of an honest man that his heart was open to the seductions of ambition or interest; or that he was capable in the slightest degree, by word or deed, of shaping his policy with a view to court popular favor or serve a selfish end; that a wish or purpose ever entered his mind inconsistent with the spotless purity of his character.

There is a modest, private mansion on the bank of the Potomac, the abode of George Washington. It boasts no spacious portal, nor gorgeous colonnade, nor massy elevation, nor storied tower. No arch or column, in courtly English or courtlier Latin, sets forth the deeds and the worth of the Father of his Country; he needs them not; the unwritten benedictions of millions cover all the walls. No gilded dome swells from the lowly roof to catch the morning or evening beam, but the love and gratitude of united America settle upon it in one eternal sunshine. From beneath that humble roof went forth the intrepid and unselfish warrior—the magistrate who knew no glory but his country's

good; to that he returned happiest when his work was done. There he lived in noble simplicity; there he died in glory and peace. While it stands, the latest generations of the grateful children of America will make their pilgrimage to it as to a shrine; and when it shall fall, if fall it must, the memory and the name of Washington shall shed an eternal glory on the spot.

—*Edward Everett.*

LIBERTY AND UNION.

Mr. President, I have thus stated the reasons of my dissent to the doctrines which have been advanced and maintained. I am conscious of having detained you and the Senate much too long. I was drawn into the debate with no previous deliberation such as is suited to the discussion of so grave and important a subject. But it is a subject of which my heart is full, and I have not been willing to suppress the utterance of its spontaneous sentiments. I cannot, even now, persuade myself to relinquish it without expressing once more my deep conviction, that since it respects nothing less than the Union of the states, it is of most vital and essential importance to the public happiness.

I profess, sir, in my career hitherto, to have kept steadily in view the prosperity and honor of the whole country and the

preservation of our federal Union. It is to that Union we owe our safety at home and our consideration and dignity abroad. It is to that Union that we are chiefly indebted for whatever makes us most proud of our country. That Union we reached only by the discipline of our virtues in the severe school of adversity. It had its origin in the necessities of disordered finance, prostrate commerce, and ruined credit. Under its benign influence these great interests immediately awoke as from the dead and sprang forth with newness of life. Every year of its duration has teemed with fresh proofs of its utility and its blessings; and, although our territory has stretched out wider and wider, and our population spread further and further, they have not outrun its protection or its benefits. It has been to us all a copious fountain of national, social, and personal happiness. I have not allowed myself, sir, to look beyond the Union to see what might lie hidden in the dark recess behind. I have not coolly weighed the chances of preserving liberty when the bonds that unite us together shall

be broken asunder. I have not accustomed myself to hang over the precipice of disunion to see whether, with my short sight, I can fathom the depth of the abyss below; nor could I regard him as a safe counselor in the affairs of this government, whose thoughts should be mainly bent on considering not how the Union should be best preserved, but how tolerable might be the condition of the people when it shall be broken up and destroyed.

While the Union lasts we have high, exciting, gratifying prospects spread out before us, for us and our children. Beyond that I seek not to penetrate the veil. God grant that in my day, at least, that curtain may not rise. God grant that, on my vision, never may be opened what lies behind. When my eyes shall be turned to behold, for the last time, the sun in heaven, may I not see him shining on the broken and dishonored fragments of a once glorious Union; on states dissevered, discordant, belligerent; on a land rent with civil feuds, or drenched, it may be, in fraternal blood! Let their last feeble and lingering glance

rather behold the gorgeous ensign of the Republic, now known and honored throughout the earth, still full high advanced, its arms and trophies streaming in their original luster, not a stripe erased or polluted, nor a single star obscured, bearing for its motto no such miserable interrogatory as, “What is all this worth?” nor those other words of delusion and folly, “Liberty first and union afterwards”; but everywhere, spread all over in characters of living light, blazing on all its ample folds as they float over the sea and over the land, and in every wind under the whole heavens, that other sentiment, dear to every true American heart—Liberty and Union, now and forever one and inseparable!

—*Daniel Webster.*

REPLY TO HAYNE.

[This speech was delivered in the United States Senate in reply to Senator Hayne of South Carolina, January 26, 1830. The subject of the discussion was the Foote resolution on the disposition of the public lands.]

MATCHES AND OVERMATCHES.

The senator from South Carolina had digressed very much from the subject under discussion. He had made an intensely partisan speech, in one part of which he questions Webster as to whether he considered himself a match in debate for the senator from Missouri (Benton).]

Mr. President, when the mariner has been tossed for many days, in thick weather and on an unknown sea, he naturally avails

himself of the first pause in the storm, the earliest glance of the sun, to take his latitude and ascertain how far the elements have driven him from his true course. Let us imitate this prudence, and, before we float further on the waves of this debate, refer to the point from which we departed, that we may at least be able to conjecture where we now are. I ask for the reading of the resolution.

(The resolution which related to the sale of public lands was here read by the secretary of the Senate.)

We have thus heard what the resolution is, which is actually before us for consideration; and it will readily occur to every one that it is almost the only subject about which something has not been said in the speech, running through two days, by which the Senate has been entertained by the gentleman from South Carolina. Every topic in the wide range of our public affairs, whether past or present—everything, general or local, whether belonging to national politics or party politics, seems to have attracted more or less of the honorable

member's attention, save only the resolution before the Senate. He has spoken of everything but the public lands. They have escaped his notice. To that subject, in all his excursions, he has not paid even the cold respect of a passing glance.

The honorable member complained that I had slept on his speech. I must have slept on it, or not slept at all. The moment the honorable member sat down, his friend from Missouri rose, and, with much honeyed commendation of the speech, suggested that the impressions which it had produced were too charming and delightful to be disturbed by other sentiments or other sounds, and proposed that the Senate should adjourn. Would it have been quite amiable in me, sir, to interrupt this excellent good feeling? Must I not have been absolutely malicious if I could have thrust myself forward to destroy sensations thus pleasing? Was it not much better and kinder, both to sleep upon them myself and to allow others also the pleasure of sleeping upon them? But if it be meant, by sleeping upon his speech,

that I took time to prepare a reply to it, it is quite a mistake. I did sleep on the gentleman's speech; and slept soundly. And I slept equally well on his speech of yesterday, to which I am now replying.

But the gentleman inquires why he was made the object of such a reply. Why was he singled out? If an attack has been made on the East, he, he assures us, did not begin it; it was the gentleman from Missouri. Sir, I answered the gentleman's speech because I happened to hear it; and because, also, I chose to give an answer to that speech which, if unanswered, I thought most likely to produce injurious impressions. I did not stop to inquire who was the original drawer of the bill. I found a responsible indorser before me, and it was my purpose to hold him liable and to bring him to his just responsibility without delay. But, sir, this interrogatory of the honorable member was only introductory to another. He proceeded to ask me whether I had turned upon him, in this debate, from the consciousness that I should find an overmatch if I ventured

on a contest with his friend from Missouri.

If, sir, the honorable member had chosen thus to defer to his friend, and to pay him a compliment, without intentional disparagement to others, it would have been quite according to the friendly courtesies of debate, and not at all ungrateful to my own feelings. I am not one of those, sir, who esteem any tribute of regard, whether light and occasional, or more serious and deliberate, which may be bestowed on others, as so much unjustly withholden from themselves. But the tone and manner of the gentleman's question forbid me thus to interpret it. I am not at liberty to consider it as nothing more than a civility to his friend. It had an air of taunt and disparagement, something of the loftiness of asserted superiority, which does not allow me to pass it over without notice. It was put as a question for me to answer, and so put as if it were difficult for me to answer, whether I deemed the member from Missouri an overmatch for myself in debate here. It seems to me, sir, that

this is extraordinary language, and an extraordinary tone, for the discussions of this body.

Matches and overmatches! Those terms are more applicable elsewhere than here, and fitter for other assemblies than this. Sir, the gentleman seems to forget where and what we are. This is a Senate, a Senate of equals, of men of individual honor and personal character, and of absolute independence. We know no masters, we acknowledge no dictators. This is a hall for mutual consultation and discussion; not an arena for the exhibition of champions. I offer myself, sir, as a match for no man; I throw the challenge of debate at no man's feet. But then, sir, since the honorable member has put the question in a manner that calls for an answer, I will give him an answer; and I tell him that, holding myself to be the humblest of the members here, I yet know nothing in the arm of his friend from Missouri, either alone or when aided by the arm of *his* friend from South Carolina, that need deter even me from espousing whatever

opinions I may choose to espouse, from debating whenever I may choose to debate, or from speaking whatever I may see fit to say, on the floor of the Senate.

Sir, when uttered as matter of commendation or compliment, I should dissent from nothing which the honorable member might say of his friend. Still less do I put forth any pretensions of my own. But when put to me as a matter of taunt, I throw it back, and say to the gentleman that he could possibly say nothing more likely than such a comparison to wound my pride of personal character. The anger of its tone rescued the remark from intentional irony, which otherwise, probably, would have been its general acceptation. But, sir, if it be imagined that by this mutual quotation and commendation; if it be supposed that, by casting the characters of the drama, assigning to each his part—to one the attack, to another the cry of onset; or if it be thought that, by a loud and empty vaunt of anticipated victory, any laurels are to be won here; if it be imagined, especially, that any or all these

things will shake any purpose of mine, I can tell the honorable member, once for all, that he is greatly mistaken, and that he is dealing with one of whose temper and character he has yet much to learn.

Sir, I shall not allow myself on this occasion, I hope on no occasion, to be betrayed into any loss of temper; but, if provoked, as I trust I never shall be, into crimination and recrimination, the honorable member may perhaps find that, in that contest, there will be blows to take as well as blows to give; that others can state comparisons as significant, at least, as his own; and that his impunity may possibly demand of him whatever powers of taunt and sarcasm he may possess. I commend him to a prudent husbandry of his resources.

—*Daniel Webster.*

COERCION OF DELINQUENT STATES.

Mr. Chairman, the honorable member who spoke yesterday went into an explanation of a variety of circumstances to prove the expediency of a change in our national government, and the necessity of a firm Union; at the same time he described the great advantages which this state, in particular, receives from the Confederacy, and its peculiar weaknesses when abstracted from the Union. In doing this, he advanced a variety of arguments which deserve serious consideration. Gentlemen have this day come forward to answer him. He has been treated as having wandered in the flowery fields of fancy, and attempts have been made to take off from the minds of the committee that sober impression which might be expected from his arguments. I trust, sir, that observations of this kind

are not thrown out to cast a light air on this important subject, or to give any personal bias on the great question before us. I will not agree with gentlemen who trifle with the weaknesses of our country; and suppose that they are enumerated to answer a party purpose, and to terrify with supposed dangers. No; I believe these weaknesses to be real, and pregnant with destruction. Yet, however weak our country may be, I hope we shall never sacrifice our liberties. If, therefore, on a full and candid discussion, the proposed system shall appear to have that tendency, let us reject it! But let us not mistake words for things, nor accept doubtful surmises as the evidence of truth. Let us consider the Constitution calmly and dispassionately, and attend to those things only which merit consideration.

No arguments drawn from embarrassment or inconvenience ought to prevail upon us to adopt a system of government radically bad; yet it is proper that these arguments, among others, should be brought into view. In doing this, yester-

day, it was necessary to reflect upon our situation; to dwell upon the imbecility of our Union; and to consider whether we, as a state, could stand alone.

Although I am persuaded this convention will be resolved to adopt nothing that is bad; yet I think every prudent man will consider the merits of the plan in connection with the circumstances of our country; and that a rejection of the Constitution may involve most fatal consequences. I make these remarks to show that though we ought not to be actuated by unreasonable fear, yet we ought to be prudent.

Sir, it appears to me extraordinary that while gentlemen in one breath acknowledge that the old Confederation requires many material amendments, they should, in the next, deny that its defects have been the cause of our political weakness and the consequent calamities of our country. I cannot but infer from this that there is still some lurking favorite imagination that this system, with corrections, might become a safe and permanent one. It is proper that we should examine this mat-

ter. We contend that the radical vice in the old Confederation is that the laws of the Union apply only to the states in their corporate capacity. Has not every man who has been in our legislature experienced the truth of this position? It is inseparable from the disposition of bodies who have a constitutional power of resistance, to examine the merits of a law. This has ever been the case with the federal requisitions. In this examination, not being furnished with those lights which directed the deliberations of the general government, and incapable of embracing the general interests of the Union, the states have almost uniformly weighed the requisitions by their own local interests; and have only executed them so far as answered their particular convenience or advantage. Hence there have ever been thirteen different bodies to judge of the measures of Congress, and the operations of government have been distracted by their taking different courses. Those which were to be benefited, have complied with the requisitions; others have totally disregarded

them. Have not all of us been witnesses to the unhappy embarrassments which resulted from these proceedings? Even during the late war, while the pressure of common danger connected strongly the bond of our union, and excited to vigorous exertions, we have felt many distressing effects of the impotent system. How have we seen this state, though most exposed to the calamities of the war, complying, in an unexampled manner, with the federal requisitions, and compelled by the delinquency of others to bear most unusual burdens! Of this truth we have the most solemn evidence on our records. In 1779 and 1780, when the state, from the ravages of war, and from her great exertions to resist them, became weak, distressed, and forlorn, every man avowed the principle we now contend for; that our misfortunes, in a great degree, proceeded from the want of vigor in the Continental government. These were our sentiments when we did not speculate, but feel. We saw our weakness, and found ourselves its victims. Let us reflect that this may again, in all

probability, be our situation. This is a weak state, and its relative station is dangerous. Your capital is accessible by land, and by sea is exposed to every daring invader; and on the northwest you are open to the inroads of a powerful foreign nation. Indeed this state, from its situation, will, in time of war, probably be the theater of its operations.

Gentlemen have said that the noncompliance of the states has been occasioned by their sufferings. This may in part be true. But has this state been delinquent? Amidst all our distresses *we* have fully complied. If New York could comply wholly with the requisitions, is it not to be supposed that the other states could in part comply? Certainly every state in the Union might have executed them in some degree. But New Hampshire, who has not suffered at all, is totally delinquent. North Carolina is totally delinquent. Many others have contributed in a very small proportion; and Pennsylvania and New York are the only states which have perfectly discharged their federal duty.

From the delinquency of those states which have suffered little by the war, we naturally conclude that they have made no efforts; and a knowledge of human nature will teach us that their ease and security have been a principal cause of their want of exertion. While danger is distant its impression is weak, and while it affects only our neighbors we have few motives to provide against it. Sir, if we have national objects to pursue, we must have national revenues. If you make requisitions and they are not complied with, what is to be done? It has been well observed that to coerce the state is one of the maddest projects that was ever devised. A failure of compliance will never be confined to a single state; this being the case, can we suppose it wise to hazard a civil war? Suppose Massachusetts or any large state should refuse, and Congress should attempt to compel them; would they not have influence to procure assistance, especially from those states who are in the same situation as themselves? What a picture does this idea present to our view!

A complying state at war with a noncomplying state; Congress marching the troops of one state into the bosom of another; this state collecting auxiliaries and forming perhaps a majority against its federal head. Here is a nation at war with itself! A government that can exist only by the sword! Every such war must involve the innocent with the guilty. This single consideration should be sufficient to dispose every peaceable citizen against such a government.

But can we believe that one state will ever suffer itself to be used as an instrument of coercion? It is a dream. It is impossible. We are brought to this dilemma: either a federal standing army is to enforce the requisitions, or the federal Treasury is left without supplies, and the government without support. What is the cure for this great evil? Nothing, but to enable the national laws to operate on individuals in the same manner as those of the states do.

What shall we do? Shall we take the old Confederation as the basis of a new sys-

tem? Can this be the object of gentlemen? Certainly not. Will any man who entertains a wish for the safety of his country trust the sword and the purse with a single Assembly, organized on principles so defective? Though we might give to such a government certain powers with safety, yet, to give them the full and unlimited powers of taxation and the national forces, would be to establish a despotism, the definition of which is, a government in which all power is concentrated in a single body. To take the old Confederation and fashion it upon these principles would be establishing a power which would destroy the liberties of the people. These considerations show clearly that a government totally different must be instituted. They had weight in the Convention who formed the new system. It was seen that the necessary powers were too great to be trusted to a single body; they therefore formed two branches, and divided the powers, that each might be a check upon the other. This was the result of their wisdom; and I presume that every reasonable man will

agree to it. The more this subject is explained, the more clear and convincing it will appear to every member of this body. The fundamental principle of the old Confederation is defective. We must totally eradicate and discard this principle before we can expect an efficient government.

—*Alexander Hamilton.*

THE CALL TO ARMS.

[Taken from the speech delivered March 20, 1775, in the Virginia Convention, held in the "Old Church" at Richmond.]

Mr. President, it is natural for man to indulge in the illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against a painful truth, and listen to the song of that siren till she transforms us into beasts. Is this the part of wise men engaged in the great and arduous struggle for liberty? Are we disposed to be of the number of those who having eyes see not, and having ears hear not, the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation? For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst, and to provide for it.

I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging of the

future but by the past. And, judging by the past, I wish to know what there has been in the conduct of the British Ministry for the last ten years to justify those hopes with which gentlemen have been pleased to solace themselves and the House. Is it that insidious smile with which our petition has been lately received? Trust it not, sir; it will prove a snare to your feet. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with a kiss. Ask yourselves how this gracious reception of our petition comports with those warlike preparations which cover our waters and darken our land. Are fleets and armies necessary to a work of love and reconciliation? Have we shown ourselves so unwilling to be reconciled that force must be called in to win back our love?

Let us not deceive ourselves, sir. These are the implements of war and subjugation, the last arguments to which kings resort. I ask gentlemen, sir, what means this martial array, if its purposes be not to force us to submission? Can gentlemen assign any other possible motive for it? Has Great Britain any enemy in this quar-

ter of the world to call for all this accumulation of navies and armies? No, sir, she has none. They are meant for us. They can be meant for no other. They are sent over to bind and rivet upon us those chains which the British Ministry have been so long forging.

And what have we to oppose them? Shall we try argument? Sir, we have been trying that for the last ten years. Have we anything new to offer upon the subject? Nothing. We have held the subject up in every light of which it is capable; but it has been all in vain. Shall we resort to entreaty and supplication? What terms shall we find that have not been already exhausted? Let us not, I beseech you, sir, deceive ourselves longer. Sir, we have done everything that could have been done to avert the storm that is now coming on. We have petitioned, we have remonstrated, we have supplicated, we have prostrated ourselves before the throne and have implored its interposition to arrest the tyrannical hands of the Ministry and Parliament.

Our petitions have been slighted, our remonstrances have produced additional violence and insult, our supplications have been disregarded, and we have been spurned with contempt from the foot of the throne. In vain, after these things, may we indulge the fond hope of peace and reconciliation. There is no longer any room for hope. If we wish to be free, if we mean to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have been so long contending; if we mean not basely to abandon the noble struggle in which we have been so long engaged, and which we have pledged ourselves never to abandon until the glorious object of our contest shall be obtained, we must fight! I repeat it, sir, we must fight! An appeal to arms and to the God of hosts is all that is left us.

They tell us, sir, that we are weak; unable to cope with so formidable an adversary. But when shall we be stronger? Will it be the next week, or the next year? Will it be when we are totally disarmed, and when a British guard shall be stationed

in every house? Shall we gather strength by irresolution and inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying supinely on our backs, and hugging the delusive phantom of hope, until our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot? Sir, we are not weak if we make a proper use of those means which the God of nature hath placed in our power.

Three millions of people armed in the holy cause of liberty, and in such a country as that which we possess, are invincible by any force which our enemy can send against us. Besides, sir, we shall not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations, and who will raise up friends to fight our battles for us. The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave. Besides, sir, we have no election. If we were base enough to desire it, it is now too late to retire from the contest. There is no retreat but in submission and slavery! Our chains are forged. Their clanking may be heard on the plains of Boston! The war is inevi-

table, and let it come! I repeat, sir, let it come!

It is vain, sir, to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry, Peace, peace! but there is no peace. The war is actually begun! The next gale that sweeps from the North will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms! Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!

—*Patrick Henry.*

LIBERTY OR EMPIRE.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I were possessed of talents or possessed of anything that might enable me to elucidate this great subject. I am not well versed in history, but I will submit to your recollection, whether liberty has been destroyed most often by the licentiousness of the people or by the tyranny of rulers. I imagine, sir, you will find the balance on the side of tyranny. Happy will you be if you miss the fate of those nations, who, omitting to resist their oppressors, or negligently suffering their liberty to be wrested from them, have groaned under intolerable despotism. Most of the human race are now in this deplorable condition; and those nations who have gone in search of grandeur, power, and splendor have also fallen a sacrifice, and been the victims of their own folly. While they acquired those visionary blessings they lost their freedom.

My great objection to this government is, that it does not leave us the means of defending our rights or of waging war against tyrants. It is urged by some gentlemen that this new plan will bring us an acquisition of strength—an army, and the militia of the states. This is an idea extremely ridiculous; gentlemen cannot be earnest. This acquisition will trample on our fallen liberty. Let my beloved Americans guard against this fatal lethargy that has pervaded the universe. Have we the means of resisting disciplined armies, when our only defense, the militia, is put into the hands of Congress? The honorable gentleman said that great danger would ensue if the convention rose without adopting this system. I ask, Where is that danger? I see none. Other gentlemen have told us, within these walls, that the union is gone or that the union will be gone. Is not this trifling with the judgment of their fellow citizens? Till they tell us the grounds of their fears I will consider them as imaginary.

I rose to make inquiry where those dan-

gers were. They could make no answer; I believe I never shall have that answer. Some minds are agitated by foreign alarms. Happily for us there is no real danger from Europe; that country is engaged in more arduous business. From that quarter there is no cause for fear. You may sleep in safety forever for them.

Where is the danger? If, sir, there is any, I recur to the American spirit to defend us—that spirit which has enabled us to surmount the greatest difficulties. To that illustrious spirit I address my most fervent prayer to prevent our adopting a system destructive to liberty. Let not gentlemen be told that it is not safe to reject this government. Wherefore is it not safe? We are told there are dangers, but those dangers are ideal; they cannot be demonstrated. To encourage us to adopt it they tell us there is a plain, easy way of getting amendments. When I come to contemplate this part, I suppose that I am mad, or that my countrymen are so. The way to amendment is, in my conception, shut. Let us consider this plain, easy way.

It appears that three-fourths of the states must ultimately agree to any amendments that may be necessary. Let us consider the consequence of this. However uncharitable it may appear, yet I must tell my opinion—that the most unworthy characters may get into power and prevent the introduction of amendments. Let us suppose—for the case is supposable, possible, and probable—that you happened to deal those powers to unworthy hands; will they relinquish powers already in their possession, or agree to amendments? Two-thirds of the Congress, or of the state legislatures, are necessary even to propose amendments. If one-third of these be unworthy men, they may prevent the application for amendments; but what is destructive and mischievous is, that three-fourths of the state legislatures or of the state conventions must concur in the amendments when proposed! In such numerous bodies there must necessarily be some designing, bad men. To suppose that so large a number as three-fourths of the states will concur, is to suppose that

they will possess genius, intelligence, and integrity, approaching the miraculous. It would indeed be miraculous that they should concur in the same amendments, or even in such as would bear some likeness to one another; for four of the smallest states, that do not collectively contain one-tenth part of the population of the United States, may obstruct the most salutary and necessary amendments. Nay, in these four states six-tenths of the people may reject these amendments; and suppose that amendments shall be opposed to amendments, which is highly probable, is it possible that three-fourths can ever agree to the same amendments? A bare majority in these four small states may hinder the adoption of amendments; so that we may fairly and justly conclude that one-twentieth part of the American people may prevent the removal of the most grievous inconvenience and oppression, by refusing to accede to amendments. A trifling minority may reject the most salutary amendments. Is this an easy mode of securing the public liberty? It is, sir, a

most fearful situation when the most contemptible minority can prevent the alteration of the most oppressive government; for it may, in many respects, prove to be such. Is this the spirit of republicanism?

—*Patrick Henry.*

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

[An address delivered before the City Club of Chicago, February 6, 1913, by Emory R. Johnson, Professor of Transportation and Commerce at the University of Pennsylvania.

The midday meeting of the City Club on February 6, 1913, was called to order by Mr. Urban A. Lavery, presiding officer. The introductory remarks from the chair were as follows:

The Chairman—"Gentlemen of the City Club: Although the speaker of today, Professor Emory R. Johnson, has been for many years professor of transportation and commerce at the University of Pennsylvania, he has in that time done conspicuous and valuable service for the United States government. In 1899 he was appointed by President McKinley to be one of the commission to investigate the question of an Isthmian canal, and to report whether or not the Panama route

should be selected. His personal report, deciding in favor of the Panama Canal, was one of the chief reasons why the Panama route was chosen. Since that time he has been intimately connected with the subsequent commission appointed by President Roosevelt. About a year ago President Taft appointed Professor Johnson 'special commissioner' to investigate the question of tolls and tonnage for the canal. The report he prepared on that question for President Taft was submitted some time ago, although the proclamation signed by the President fixing the tolls was issued but recently. That proclamation, drafted by Professor Johnson, was signed by President Taft without changing a word, so you will see that Professor Johnson is intimately acquainted with his subject. He is also thoroughly familiar with the question of railroad transportation in this country. I think the occasion of hearing Professor Johnson talk on the subject of Panama Canal tolls is a fortunate one for Chicagoans. I take great pleasure in introducing to you Professor Johnson of the

University of Pennsylvania." (Applause.)]

PROFESSOR EMORY R. JOHNSON.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen of the City Club: I am very glad to accept the invitation of the City Club to speak here today, because I am in sympathy with your undertaking. The use of that phrase, 'in sympathy with your undertaking,' suggests a short story which may not have been heard by all of you.

"The story is that three members of the Black Hand fraternity wrote a letter to a gentleman informing him that if he did not leave \$5,000 under the church steps at nine o'clock the next evening they would kidnap his wife. The man who received the letter went to the church steps at the time appointed and deposited an envelope. When he got out of sight, the three members of the Black Hand fraternity appeared, withdrew the envelope from its hiding place, and on opening it found a note which read: 'Gentlemen: I have no \$5,000, but I am in sympathy with your undertaking.' (Laughter.)

“I understand your undertaking to be to study public questions, and to help in a better solution of them. For that reason I am requested to speak to you upon a public question which is attracting the attention of the country. That is the question of the administration of the Panama Canal, and especially the question of the Panama Canal tolls.

“The people of the United States are deeply interested in the Panama Canal. The achievement of our engineers at Panama is a source of national pride, and it is the earnest desire of every patriotic citizen that the administration of the canal shall be as creditable to our country as its construction has been; that the policy of the United States in the operation of the canal shall commend itself to the judgment of the American nation and of all countries the world over.

THE HAY-PAUNCEFOTE TREATY AND
CANAL TOLLS.

“The Hay-Pauncefote treaty and the policy of exempting the coastwise carriers

from toll payment are questions that are being earnestly debated. The issues involved concern our relations with foreign countries; it is the belief of a large part of the people of the United States that the issues involve the nation's honor; and it is the conviction of an apparently increasing number that the controversy over the Hay-Pauncefote treaty has arisen because of the granting of an unjustifiable subsidy to the owners of coastwise vessels.

“It is not my purpose to discuss the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, nor could I do so with propriety. It is well known that two views are held as to the meaning of that treaty. One interpretation of the treaty is that it provides for the use of the canal under the same conditions by vessels of all flags, American and foreign; that the principle of the equal and neutral use of the canal, as broadly established by article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of 1850, was incorporated without impairment in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty of 1901; and that we have promised by that agreement to treat the vessels owned by citizens of

our country the same as we treat vessels under the British or other foreign flags.

“The other view entertained as to the meaning of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is that by it the United States formulated the rules to be observed by nations other than the United States in their use of the canal; that the United States by this treaty with Great Britain guaranteed to treat vessels under the British flag as favorably as the vessels under the flags of other foreign nations. Those who hold this view of the treaty contend that Congress did not violate the treaty in exempting the owners of coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls.

“Great Britain gives a different interpretation to article 3, section 1, of the treaty, which declares that:

“ ‘The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or other-

wise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable.'

"The British government holds that this and other parts of the treaty obligate the United States to charge the same tolls on vessels of American ownership and registry as are levied upon vessels registered in Great Britain and other foreign countries, and the British government requests that should this view not be accepted by the United States the meaning of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty shall be determined by arbitration in accordance with the provisions of the arbitration treaty of 1908.

"It must be especially gratifying to the people of the entire country that both President Taft and ex-President Roosevelt have declared themselves unequivocally in favor of submitting to arbitration the meaning of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, if the question at issue cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomatic negotiation.

"Another way of setting at rest the present controversy is to repeal the toll exemption clause of the Panama Canal act of August 24, 1912. A bill to repeal that

clause was introduced into the House of Representatives at the last session of Congress by Representative Sims of Tennessee, and has been introduced into the Senate this session of Congress by Senator Root. Thus, while the executive department of the government is carrying on diplomatic negotiations with Great Britain as to the meaning of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, Congress is considering whether it may not be wise to repeal the toll exemption clause and thus to remove all cause of international controversy.

“As between arbitration of the question of the exemption of the owners of the coastwise shipping from the payment of Panama tolls, and the repeal of the toll exemption clause of the canal act, the latter course seems the simpler and the wiser one to pursue. If we arbitrate and lose, we must return all the tolls that have been collected and henceforth either charge no tolls or collect the same tolls on all vessels using the canal. If we arbitrate and win, we will but have established our right to pursue a policy which is, at least, of doubtful wisdom.

COASTWISE TOLL EXEMPTION.

“Whatever the Hay-Pauncefote treaty may ultimately be held to mean, the policy of exempting the owners of the coastwise ships from canal tolls should be decided upon its merits. Although it be admitted that the international bearings of the question are of paramount importance at the present moment, the wisdom or unwisdom of coastwise toll exemption as a domestic policy ought to receive careful consideration. Indeed, there seems special reason for calling attention to the economic effects of toll exemption and of urging that those effects be carefully studied.

“The American people will insist that our treaty obligations, whatever they may be, shall be fulfilled. The national conscience may be relied upon to require our government to maintain our honor among nations. In the treaty of 1908, we agreed with Great Britain that ‘differences which may arise of a legal nature or relating to the interpretation of treaties existing between the two contracting parties, and

which it may not have been possible to settle by diplomacy, shall be referred to the permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague.' It can hardly be doubted that our country will live up to the principle established by this treaty. Diplomatic negotiation, or the arbitration of the meaning of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty will eventually adjust the international question; but our course concerning toll exemption as a domestic policy must be determined by our judgment as to what is in the interest of the general public; and, in this case, a sober second judgment must determine our final decision.

CANAL SHOULD BE COMMERCIAL-
LY SELF-SUPPORTING

"It will hardly be necessary to urge upon this audience the importance of adhering to business principles in the management of the Panama Canal. It will be accepted by you as axiomatic that the United States government should operate

the canal in a business-like way; that the tolls charged by the government should, if possible, be such as will stimulate traffic and at the same time safeguard the owners of the waterway against an annual deficit. If it were a private enterprise, you would insist upon its being managed, if possible, so as to yield its owners a profit; but, the canal being a government undertaking, you would probably deem it wise to collect such revenues as are needed to meet operating and maintenance expenses and interest charges, and to provide a sinking fund that will eventually return to the treasury the sum invested in the canal.

“The Panama Canal act of August 24, 1912, authorized the President to fix the tolls within a maximum limit of \$1.25 per net vessel ton; and the President, acting in accordance with that law, has established a schedule of tolls which impose a charge of \$1.20 per net ton upon merchant vessels and 50 cents per displacement ton upon warships. These tolls are reasonable and are within what the traffic will readily bear. They put the Suez and Panama

Canals upon an even footing as competitors for the trade between the countries of the north Atlantic and the countries of the Orient. They will not divert from the canal route much of the traffic of the west coast of South America. They would amount to but a small part of the saving effected by the Panama Canal for ships making voyages between the two seaboard of the United States. Indeed, the tolls of \$1.20 per net ton upon merchant vessels would be equivalent to an average of only about 60 cents per ton of cargo carried through the canal by freight vessels; for freight steamers have an average lading of one and three-quarters to two and one-half tons of cargo for each net vessel ton. The uses of the word 'ton' are confusing; but a ton of ocean freight means either 2,240 pounds or 40 cubic feet of space, while a vessel ton means 100 cubic feet. It is usually possible to stow between two and three tons of freight in a space of 100 cubic feet.

“Doubtless all will agree that the canal ought not to be a continuing burden upon

the general taxpayers of the country. It should be made commercially self-supporting, if that can be done without unduly restricting the usefulness of the waterway to the commerce of the United States and to the trade of the world. The canal will have cost the people of the United States at least \$375,000,000. The interest and principal of this investment must be paid either from the funds secured by general taxes or from the revenues derived from canal tolls. Political prudence as well as sound methods of public financing make it advisable to require those who derive immediate benefit from the Panama Canal to pay a reasonable toll for the use of the waterway. The United States should conserve its revenues. They are required in ever larger amounts for the promotion of the public health, for public works and for the maintenance of the military power and naval prestige of the United States. Taxes must inevitably increase, and if the burden of carrying the Panama Canal is to be thrown upon the federal treasury and the taxpayers of the country instead of upon

the producers, traders and ship owners who make profitable use of the canal in carrying on their business, the reasons must be clear and convincing.

“The wisdom or unwisdom of the exemption of the owners of coastwise ships from the payment of Panama tolls must depend largely upon whether it is necessary to collect tolls from all vessels in order to make the canal self-supporting and to prevent it from adding another permanent load to the increasing burdens of the general taxpayers. It is estimated that \$19,250,000 will be required annually to make the canal commercially self-sustaining. This total is made up of \$3,500,000 for operating and maintenance expenses, \$500,000 for sanitation and Zone government, \$250,000 which is the annuity payable to Panama under the treaty of 1903, \$11,250,000 to pay 3 per cent on the \$375,000,000 invested in the canal, and \$3,750,000 for an amortization fund of 1 per cent per annum upon the cost of the canal.

CANAL REVENUES.

“The revenues to meet these expenses must be secured from the tonnage using the canal. It is estimated that during the first year or two of the canal’s operation the annual net tonnage of the shipping passing through the canal will amount to about 10,500,000 tons. Of this amount about 1,000,000 net tons will consist of shipping engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States. It is further estimated that by the end of the first decade—that is, in 1925—the total net tonnage of shipping passing through the canal annually will be about 17,000,000 tons, of which at least 2,000,000 tons will be contributed by the coastwise shipping. It is thus possible that about \$12,600,000 per annum might be secured from tolls during the first two or three years of the canal’s operation, if all vessels, American and foreign, were required to pay the tolls fixed by the President in his proclamation of November 13, 1912. If the Panama Canal act stands unamended and the coastwise ship-

ping is exempted from tolls, the initial receipts from the canal will probably amount to less than \$10,500,000 per annum.

“The total traffic in 1925 will presumably amount to about 17,000,000 net tons. In all probability the rate of tolls will by that time have been reduced to \$1 per net ton upon merchant vessels. It will not be wise to charge higher tolls at Panama than are levied at Suez. The tolls at Suez are now \$1.20 per net ton and they have been reduced several times during the past decade. It is probable that the prophecy of De Lesseps will be realized and that the Suez tolls will, within a few years, be brought down to 5 francs, about \$1, per net ton. There is thus a possible aggregate revenue of \$17,000,000 per annum in 1925, obtainable from canal tolls, if all ships are required to pay the dues. The exemption of the coastwise shipping will reduce the revenue in 1925 to about \$15,000,000 a year, or to less than the estimated annual outlay for operation, Zone sanitation and government, the Panama annuity, and the interest on the amount invested

in the canal. The revenues would yield no surplus for betterments and nothing for the amortization of the \$375,000,000 or more which the people of the United States will have paid for the canal.

“These calculations indicate clearly that the United States will need to collect tolls from the owners of the ships engaged in the American coastwise trade in order to secure revenues large enough to meet the canal’s current expenses and its capital charges. The United States can be justified in relieving the coastwise carriers from the payment of tolls, and thus in reducing the canal revenues by \$18,000,000 or \$20,000,000 during the first decade of the operation of the waterway, only upon the condition that the general public rather than the owners of the coastwise vessels, will profit from the loss of revenue to the government. Who will gain by toll exemption, the coastwise carriers or the general public?

“An effective argument often urged in favor of exempting the coastwise carriers from canal tolls is that the freight rates

paid by shippers both by coastwise water routes, and, what is far more important, by the all-rail lines across the country, will be lower by the rate of tolls not paid for the use of the Panama Canal. This argument assumes that the carriers by water will compete so actively with each other and with the railroads as to bring the rates as low as the cost of the service will allow; and that if the cost of transportation by water between the two seaboard is increased by canal tolls the rates of the water carriers must be, and the charges of the rail lines will be, higher by the amount of the canal tolls. This reaches to the core of the theory of rate-making. Will the adjustment of the rates of the coastwise carriers and of the railroads be the result of a rate-controlling competition among the water lines, and will it be the policy of the railroads to compete actively with the coastwise carriers for practically all of the traffic moving between the two seaboard?

EFFECT OF THE CANAL UPON RAILROAD RATES.

“Perhaps the most convincing evidence upon this question is not that afforded by the theory of transportation rates but by testimony of men who make or control rates. The manager of a large steamship company engaged in the trade between the two seaboard of the United States remarked that ‘it has always been my theory that the ship rather than the shipper paid the tolls.’ The vice-president of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, who is a practical railroad man as well as an experienced steamship man, testified before the Senate Committee on Inter-Oceanic Canals last year that the tolls on the coastwise shipping will be an operating expense that will have to be borne by the carrier. The head of one of the largest manufacturing corporations of the United States—a corporation that operates a large fleet of ocean steamers—gave it as his opinion that the rates of freight between the two seaboard will not be affected by the tolls upon coastwise shipping.

“You are familiar with the theory that transportation charges are fixed primarily with reference to what the shipper can afford to pay—what the traffic will bear—and only secondarily with regard to the cost of the service. Carriers, whether by rail or by water, cannot disregard the costs of the service, but they make their rates such as they think shippers can afford to pay.

“You also know it to be the practice of steamship lines when operating between common termini to adjust their rates and services by conferences. The general public is being made aware of this by the evidence now being presented to the Merchant Marine Committee of the House of Representatives, and it is coming to be a matter of common knowledge that the informal organizations or conferences of steamship companies are able to regulate competition and to prevent rates from being forced thereby to the level below which the business would be unprofitable. The relation of the coastwise steamship companies with each other will be so regulated in their con-

ferences that their charges will tend to be what the traffic will bear — that is, what shippers will pay to have their goods transported by water instead of by rail. The tendency of the coastwise carriers operating through the canal will be to adjust their charges with reference to the schedules of railroad rates. In other words, the charges of the steamship lines will not be based upon the costs of service, including the tolls, but will be what the traffic will bear. Thus, whether there be tolls or not, the rates paid by shippers patronizing the coastwise lines will be the same.

“The exceptionally large producers and traders who ship goods in vessels which they own or charter will, it is true, enjoy lower transportation charges between the two seaboards of the United States, if the government relieves them from the payment of Panama tolls; and in so far as the railroads compete with chartered vessels for lumber, coal, ore and similar traffic, the canal tolls will be of advantage to the railroads. This advantage, however, will be more theoretical than real, for it is not

probable that the railroads can compete with the carriers by water for bulk cargoes of lumber, coal, ore and similar products. The railroads will be obliged to allow that traffic to go by water and the charter rates on that traffic will not be affected by rail competition.

“In considering the effect of the canal upon railroad rates, the fact should be borne in mind that only a small portion of the total traffic of the transcontinental railroads will be subject to rail and water competition. It has been estimated that if the transcontinental railroads maintain their schedule of rates they may possibly lose one-tenth of their through traffic to the coastwise carriers. It will doubtless be the policy of the railroads to allow a portion of the traffic that might, by active rate competition, be held to the rails, to be shipped coastwise through the canal. It will be more to the advantage of the railroads to maintain profitable rates upon their traffic as a whole than to disturb their intricate rate structure for the sake of holding that small portion of their traffic

for which the water carriers may possibly compete.

THE FREIGHT PROBLEM SUMMARIZED.

“The effect which canal tolls on coastwise shipping will have upon rail and water rates, and the adjustment of the charges of coastwise carriers and the railroads engaged in handling traffic between the two seaboards of the United States may be summarized as follows:

“The rates on traffic handled by regular steamship lines between the two seaboards will be but slightly affected by canal tolls. Only such producers and traders as use vessels which they own or charter for the shipment of full cargoes will profit by the exemption of the coastwise shipping from tolls. Probably 99 out of every 100 shippers will pay the same rate whether there be tolls or not. Most of the intercoastal traffic will consist of general commodities and package freight handled by the established steamship lines. Bulk cargoes of lumber, coal, ore and heavy steel

products will comprise a relatively small share of the total traffic. The rates charged by the several steamship lines will be the same. The charges will be regulated by agreements among the competing companies and will be fixed primarily with reference to what the traffic will bear and only secondarily, if at all, with reference to the cost of the service to the carriers. The several steamship lines will maintain relatively stable schedules of charges which will ordinarily be adjusted with reference to the even more stable schedule of commodity and class rates maintained by the transcontinental railroads and their eastern rail connections. If the regular steamship lines are required to pay Panama tolls, their payments to the government will be a part of their operating expenses, which will thus be increased by the amount of the tolls. If the steamship companies are exempted from the payment of tolls they will thereby receive a subsidy equal to the amount of the tolls not collected by the government.

DOES COASTWISE SHIPPING NEED ASSISTANCE?

“The policy of toll exemption for the owners of the coastwise ships was urged upon Congress by appeals to patriotism. It was held to be a duty to aid the merchant marine under the American flag and a subsidy in the form of toll exemption was granted to the owners of coastwise ships. No assistance has been given vessels serving the foreign trade of the United States. The carriers that have been given this subsidy have a monopoly of the coastwise traffic, as no foreign-owned ships are allowed to enter the domestic trade. Was the subsidy necessary, or is it justifiable?

“Senator Root, in the eloquent and forceful speech which he delivered in the Senate, January 21, 1913, characterized the coastwise shipping business as ‘the most highly and absolutely protected special industry in the United States.’ This industry, moreover, is prosperous, not languishing. There are over 3,500,000 tons of ships enrolled for the domestic trade, on the Atlantic and Pacific seaboards. There was an increase

in tonnage of 38 per cent during the decade ending in 1911, and the opening of the Panama Canal will cause a large addition to be made to the coastwise fleet. It would seem that our navigation laws now give the shipping owned by the coastwise carriers sufficient aid and protection. At least, the burden of proof is upon the coastwise steamship companies to show need of further assistance.

“If a government subsidy is to be given to the owners of American ships, ought not the public funds to go to the vessels that need assistance—to those that serve our foreign trade in competition with foreign-owned vessels? I would not oppose government aid to American-owned vessels engaged in the foreign trade of the United States. Other countries have granted such subsidies; but it should be noted that the experience of Japan, Germany, and even of Great Britain shows that the effective ship subsidies are those paid to strong lines. The effective subsidies are those that so strengthen selected strong lines of strategic importance to trade as to make

those lines able to meet foreign competition and to increase in strength year by year.

NEED OF AMERICAN SHIPS IN THE PACIFIC.

“There are reasons why the United States might well seek to have a strong line of vessels under the American flag running from the west coast of the United States by way of Hawaii, Japan and China to the Philippines. It would be desirable, from the point of view of the development of our foreign trade, to have an equally strong line out to Australia from our west coast; to have a line from the Atlantic and gulf ports down the east coast of South America to Buenos Aires, and another through the Panama Canal down the west coast of South America to Valparaiso. If we are to give the owners of American ships \$20,000,000 during the next ten years, the funds had better go to build up such lines as have been mentioned instead of being given to the owners of the coast-wise ships.

“In advocating the policy of adhering to business principles in the management of the Panama Canal, it is not recommended that the rate of tolls should be high. Indeed, the schedule of charges fixed by the President establishes relatively low rates—rates that will not unduly restrict the use of the canal. The owners of the vessels that serve the coastwise trade will derive greater benefit from the canal than will the owners of any other vessels. Rates double those established by the President might be imposed without preventing the canal from being used by the coastwise carriers. In view of these facts, it seems just that those who derive immediate benefit from the use of the canal should pay reasonable tolls.” (Applause.)

INDEX

A

- After-dinner speaking, 33-35; Brander Matthews on, 35-42.
"Analysis of Oratorical Style," quoted, 59.
Anecdote as used by after-dinner speaker, 37, 38, 56.
Apostrophe, use of, 63.
Argumentative speech, 66 *et al.*

B

- Blouet, Paul, *see* O'Rell, Max.
Bolenius, Miss, quoted, 51, 52.
Brewer, David J., quoted, 8.
Bryan, William Jennings, quoted, 12-14.

C

- Chesterfield, Lord, quoted, 24.
Choate, Rufus, quoted, 26-32.
Cleveland, Grover, quoted, 11, 12.
Conversation, John H. Vincent on, 15.
Conviction, Daniel Webster on, 17.

D

- Delivery of after-dinner speech, 34, 35.

E

- Earnestness in presentation essential, 14.
Eloquence, Ralph Waldo Emerson on, 19-25; Rufus Choate on, 26-32.
Eloquence, aim of, 26.
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, quoted, 19-25.
Everett, Edward, quoted, 73-81.

Exclamation; employment of, 61.

Extemporaneous speaking, Abraham Lincoln on, 7.

F

Figures of speech, use of, 61-65.

G

Gladstone, William E., quoted, 7.

Gunsaulus, Frank W., D. D., quoted, 9, 10.

H

Hamilton, Alexander, quoted, 94-103.

Hawthorne as speaker, 40.

Henry, Patrick, quoted, 104-109, 110-115.

Hillis, Newell Dwight, quoted, 9.

Hoar, Judge, speeches of, 38, 39.

Hyperbole, use of, 62.

I

Illustrations, use of, 54-65.

Interrogation, use of, 62.

Irony, employment of, 62.

Irving as speaker, 40.

J

Johnson, Dr., on national style, 25.

Johnson, Emory R., quoted, 116-143.

Jordan, David Starr, quoted, 10.

K

Knowledge of subject essential to speaker, 13, 14.

L

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, quoted, 43-46.

Lawyer, importance of oratory and extemporaneous speaking to, 7.

Lincoln, Abraham, quoted, 7, 67-72.

Lowell as speaker, 37.

M

Man in the street, speech of, 24.
Matthews, Brander, quoted, 35-42.
Metaphor, use of, 63.
Metonymy, use of, 63.
Mixed figures of speech, 64, 65.

N

National style, Dr. Johnson on, 25.
Natural tone and manner, John H. Vincent on, 15.
Newspapers, said to take place of platform, 12, 13.

O

"Oral Composition," by Miss Ward, quoted, 53.
Orator, the work of the, in the words of William E. Gladstone, 7; power of, as described by David J. Brewer, 8; by Frank W. Gunsaulus, D.D., 9, 10; by David Starr Jordan, 10; a hero, 20.
Oratory, Abraham Lincoln on, 7; David J. Brewer on, 8; John H. Vincent on, 14-16; of Sheridan, at trial of Warren Hastings, 20.
O'Rell, Max, quoted, 47-50.

P

Passions stirred by eloquence, 26, 27.
Personification, use of, 64.
Poetry, words of, 25.
Public speaking, William Jennings Bryan on, 12-14.
Pulpit address, John H. Vincent on, 14-16.

Q

Quotation as used by after-dinner speaker, 38.

R

Revolutionary periods, eloquence of, Rufus Choate on, 26-32.

S

- "Selected Speeches for Practice," quoted, 57.
Sentiment in after-dinner speech, 34.
Sheridan's oratory at trial of Warren Hastings, 20.
Simile, use of, 64.
Speaker, outlines for, 51-53.
Speaking plainly and directly, importance of, 10.
Story, place of, in after-dinner speaking, 34, 36, 37.
Street, language of the, 24.
Style, Dr. Johnson on, 25.

T

- "Talking" rather than orating, 15.
"Teaching of Oral English," by Miss Bolenius, quoted, 51, 53.
Thackeray as speaker, 40.

V

- Vincent, Bishop John H., quoted, 14-16.
Vision, its use by speaker, 62.
Voice, charm of a good, 22, 23.

W

- Ward, Miss, quoted, 53.
Webster, Daniel, quoted, 17, 18, 82-93.

